

THE CHVRCH CONQVERANT OVER

HVMANE WIT.

O R

The Churches Authority demonstrated
by *M. William Chillingworth* (the
Proctour for *VVit* against her) his
perpetual Contradictions, in his booke
entituled,

*The Religion of Protestants a safe VVay
to Salvation.*



*In ventre Ecclesiz Veritas manet: Quisquis ab hoc ventre se-
paratus fuerit, necesse est vt falsa loquatur. Aug. in Ps. 37. v. 4.*

Permissu Superiorum. 1638.



THE PREFACE.



WHOEVER hath attentively perused the *Booke*, the *Confutation* wherof I haue vndertaken, cannot but with horroure perceaue therein a direct, and often iterated exprobatation made to the whole *Army of the liuing God*. For he chargeth as subiect to

vnuerfall damnable Errours, not only the present Catholike Church, and that of some later tymes before; but also the most prime and Primitiue (a) Ages of the 5. 4. 3. 2. by Name, yea the Church Apostolicall, the (b) Blessed Apostles themselves, euen after they had receaued the Holy Ghost.

(a) Pag. 292. nn.

(b) Pag. 91.

(b) Pag. 144. n. 31.

2. Against this Defyer, and Challenger of the Church of God, as I did hartily wish, so did I hopefully expect, that of the famous *Vniuersity*, in the sight and hearing wherof this hatefull exprobatation was made, an *Vniuersity* stored with so many well experienced warriours and redoubted Champions, some one would haue appeared in field with the complete Armour of Christian inuincible learning. My desire was grounded on feare, least otherwayes in the iudgment of Posterity the most vnpartiall Arbiter of former demerits, this *Nursery of sciences* in ancient tymes so renowned for Christian piety and learning, might be thought to haue

wanted, in this occasion, either *Knowledge of Theology* to discern, or *Maturity of Iudgment* to consider, or *Zeale of Christianity* to detest, or *Grace of Elocution* to confute such vnchristian Principles.

3. What may have been the cause of this their forbearance, I will not passe my Iudgment. Whatsoever it were, I am confident of their *Christianity*, that they will approue, fauour, and applaud *Christianity* maintained, and say with *S. Paul*, (c) *so that Christ be preached any manner of way, I ioy therein, and will ioy.* Which Treatise if they haue read ouer & perused, I dare say, they haue found therein a little *Dauid*, short and solid, pious and pithy, learned and religious, armed with *smooth stones* of cleere Truth, gathered from the *current* of Christian Tradition, deliuered by the *Pastorall* sling of the Churches Authority. On the other side, a mighty Giant destitute of all the signes and markes of a Christian souldier, armed neither with the authority of the present Christian Church, nor perpetuall *Traditions*, nor *Councells*, nor *Consent of Fathers*, nor with their single sentences, which he reiects as *Bul-rushes* of no strength.

4. Helayeth claime to the *Armour of light*, the Holy Bible: but this is only to daunt his Aduersary with words, not to vse the same in deeds: For neuer Writer appeared in matter of Controuersy more bare then he is of this kind of prooffe. He hath cited twice or thrice some texts of Scripture, so few, and so short, that I dare say, al the words of Scripture vrged in his Booke against vs may be cōprized in ten lynes. He cōfideth only in the *launce* of his *Dialectical Discourse*, (d) which he presumeth he can deliuer so assuredly by the stronge Arme of his *Human Reason*, and dexterity of naturall *Wit*, as euer infat-

(c) Phil.
lip. 1. 18.

(d) Dis-
course
ground-
ed on

The Preface.

5

infallibly (e) to hit the marke of reuealed Truth.

5. That short Treatise, as I said, of *Christianity main-
tained*, hath foyled this daring challenger by a stroke
on the forehead, by laying open his *Principles*, how they
destroy *Christianity*; wherby he cannot but fall to the
ground in the Iudgment of all Christian Churches.
The spoyles of his victory, he leaueth to his *Armiger* to
gather, that he may also haue part of the honour, and
in the glorious victory, which is, as (f) *S. Hierome* sayth,
*cum Dauide extorquere gladium de aduersarij manibus, & su-
perbissimi Golia caput proprio mucrone truncare*, to confute
and make away with the heads of his erroneous do-
ctrine, by the force of his owne sword, his words, say-
ings, and principles.

6. To take this course for the Confutation of his
Booke I was vrged by *Necessity*, and *Charity*. *Necessity*,
against an Aduersary who denyeth all the Principles
of Christian fayth. He often repeates with much pride,
but still without prooffe: (g) *I see plainly and with my
owne eyes, that there are Popes against Popes, Councils against
Councils, some Fathers against others, the same Fathers
against themselves, a consent of Fathers in one age against a
consent of Fathers in another age, the Church of one age
against the Church of another Age*. Scripture remaynes,
which he doth (though not so openly and professedly,
yet) cleerely and manifestly discard, as a contradi-
ctious witnes. For he teacheth, that in respect of making
a thing incredible, or of no credit, it is all one (h) whether the
Contradictions be reall, or only seeming: So that a writing
full of seeming contradictions can be of no more cre-
dit with vs, then if the contradictions were reall. Now
he professeth, that (i) in all Controuersies betwixt Prote-
stants one with another, which are innumerable, there is still a

Scripture by
the ne-
uer fay-
ling ru-
les of
Logicke
Preface
n. 12.

(e) By
discour-
se no
man can
possibly
be lead
into Er-
rour.
ibid.

(f) *Epist.*
84.

(g) *Pag.*
376. lin.
6. pag.
131. lin.

(h) *Pag.*
215. lin.
16.

(i) *Pag.*
136. n. 9.
seeming lin. 15.

seeming conflict of Scripture with Scripture; that the Scripture may with so great probabilities be alleaged on both sides,

(k) Pag. 41. l. 7. *that we (k) may expect an Elias to reconcile the repugnances.*
If then the Scripture be to our seeming, full of conflicts and irreconcilable repugnances, as well as Popes, Councils, Fathers, how can it be of more authority & credit?

7. Who doth not see, that there is no way to deale with this man, but to hamper him in the knots of his
(l) Pag. 132. l. 15. *owne speech, from the Authority wherof he will not disclayme. He is not (l) an Idolatour of S. Austen, but of himselfe: D. Field (m) is not infallible, but he is: Optatus (n) his sayings be not fit to determine contronersies of Fayth, but his are. S. Cyprians (o) sentences be not a rule of faith, but his be. The Scripture is full of seeming cōflicts, Contradictions, and irreconcilable Repugnances; but he will never confesse so much of his owne Booke. There be Christian Ages against Christian Ages; but he will thinke we do him wronge, if we say, that in his writings Pages are repugnant to Pages, yea many tymes sentences of the same Page are at deadly food the one with the other. This then is the way to confute, and confound him; to shew that being lead by passion one way, and by the euidence of truth another, he hath spokē feelily & vayne-ly against the Authority of the Church, solidly and iudiciously for it.*

8. This is the stile still held by the Almighty to vanquish and ouerthrow the Enemyes of his Church
(p) 7/3. 19 14. *by sending the (p) spirit of giddines vpon them. A victory which may seeme not vnlike that which Gedeon (q) got against the Madianites, who lay like a multitude of locusts wasting and destroying the land of Israel. Three hundred souldiers by Gods appointment, hauing empty pitchers*

The Preface.

7

pitchers in their hands, and in ech of the pitchers a light hidden, breaking the pitchers one against the other, the *Madianites* were confounded with the sudden noise and light; so as they fell to (r)quarell with ech other, and mutually destroy themselves. The Con-^{(r) f m-}ceytes of this man may be termed *a multitude of locusts* ^{mist Do-} which wast and consume *the whole land of Israel*, all the ^{gladium} grounds and principles of Christian fayth. In his Booke ^{in omni-} there be Pages (thole aparted which cōteyne the Text ^{but ca-} of *Charity mantayned*) about three hūdred, which empty ^{stri of} of prooffe for his owne Religion, haue hidden in them ^{in us se} the light of Catholike Truth. These Pages being in this ^{ced:} Reply, by violent encounter of his direct Contradi- ^{tr m ca-} tions, beaten and broken the one against the other, ^{ban:} *sound out by the noyse of the cracke*, the emptinesse of his wayne Religion, and togeather shew forth the cleere light of Catholike doctrin. Hence his wasting and destructive Principles come to fight togeather, and destroy ech other, and so leaue the holy Church, and the *Gedeon* therof, *conquerant ouer humane Wit*.

9. *Charity* also hath set me on this Course of answering, by the discouery of his Contradictions, as iudging the same more efficacious then any other, for the reclayming of him, and the like Wanderers who are lead into contempt of the Churches Authority, by the ouer-valuing of their owne wits. When he shall find himselfe, and others see him lost in a labyrinth of inexplicable perplexities, enclosed on euery side with the contrarieties of his owne sayings, they will happily reflect, how weake, blynd, miserable humane Reason is, and vnfit to be the guide of Christians in their *walking by fayth* towards eternall life. For this cause, haue I stiled this Treatise, *The Church conquerant ouer humane Wit*,

to signify that he needs not be more ashamed of being conquered by the Church, then of being of the number of men. My drift is not to insult ouer him fallen so low into folly, but to condescend to help him vp againe, by confessing my selfe subiect to the like imbecillity of wit. My mind is not to blast or blemish the good opinion, that some may haue conceaued of his sharpe vnderstanding; nor do I charge him with any want of common Iudgmēt, besides that which is caused throgh want of *speciall Grace*. It was want of *Grace* that he vndertooke the vngracious Attempt of opposing the whole Church of God, no want of *Wit* not to haue performed what no wit can effect. No man will haue better successe that shall go about so bad an enterprize.

10. Giuing thanks vnto God, I may confesse, that Catholike Education hath instilled into my soule such reuerence towards the whole Church of Christ, as I know not what way I should go about to oppose her Iudgment: that were there no other way to saluation, then that which this man teacheth, and runneth, of relying on my owne wit and discourse, against *the whole Church, Generall Councells, Consent of Fathers*; I should verily thinke saluation for me impossible. Neuerthelesse should I be tempted, and such a phrensy of Pride take hold of my soule, I belieue I should fall into the like Contradictions against my selfe, as now I admire how this man being of so good a wit, could possibly fall into. What he telleth vs out of *Gusman de Alfarache*, (1) *that the Hospitall of fooles is of a large extent*, I do verily admit to be most true. And therefore being as all men are, sick & subiect to ignorāce about diuine matters, should refuse to be vnder the C V R E of the Catholike Church, I am perswaded, I should be no sooner out of the Hospitall

(1) *Pag.*
12 n. 50.

The Preface.

9

tall of *Santo Spirito* at Rome, then in *Goofmans Hofpitall*,
in the number of those who, as *S. Paul* (u) sayth, *Presu- (u) Di-*
ming themselves to be wise, prooue to be fooles, by contradi- *centes se*
ctions against themselves. *sapientes*
stultifica-

11. King Alexander by selfe flattery, and the flattery
of others, thought himselfe to be the *Sonne of Iupiter*, *Rom. i.*
but wounded in battaile, he became docible and apt to *21.*
learne the lesson, which bloud running about his eares,
told and taught him, *that he was mortall*. But *M. Chilling-*
worth being entred into the lists of single Combat with
the *Maintayner of Charity*, though he be beaten, woun-
ded, disgraced at euery bout, forced to contradict him-
selfe, to say and vn say, to recall his words, to deny his
grantes; yet high conceyte of his owne worth, makes
him so insensible of these his wounds, as he doth boast
and bragge, that in answering the *Maintayners* Argu-
ments *he hath not byn any way perplexed*. I therefore in this
Confutation open againe the woundes which selfe-
Ignorance had closed vp from his sight, that by these
ouertures that holesome lesson of Christian Humility
may find entrance into his head and heart, *That no wit*
of man, is a fit match to encounter with the whole Catho-
like Church.

12. Wherein if I put him to some payne, he will I *(x) Me-*
hope remember, that it is (x) better to be recalled to *liora sunt*
life out of a sound, by the blowes of a friend, then to be *vulnera*
betrayed, and stifled vnto death by the kisses of a foe *diligentis*
He hath drunke ouer much of the sweet milke of selfe *quam*
pleasing Conceyte, which by flattery of some other *frandu-*
may be increased in him, that he seemes lulled into a *lenta of-*
dead sleep as (y) *Sisara* was. I can do him no greater cha- *cula o-*
rity, then to pinch him with his own Contradictions (y) *dientis.*
so hard, and hould him so fast, that he may in the depth *Prou:*
4. *27. 6.*
(y) Ind.

B

of

(2) *Soporem mortis
conso-
cians de-
fecit &
mortuus
est.*

of his soule feele the smart of his folly, and awake to repent before (2) *label*, or rather Hell strike the nayle of obdurate obstinacy into his head, and so ioyne his sleep with death, his death with euerlasting damnation.

(a) *Gregor. in
cap. 39.
166.
In sinum
virginis
omni se-
ritate de-
posita ca-
pit depo-
nit.
2. Cor.
10. 5.
In capti-
uitatem
redigen-
tes om-
nem in-
tellectum
in obse-
quium
Christi.*

13. Together with the discouery of Contradictions, I still lay open & demonstrate in them, and by them, the Infallible Authority of the Church assisted not to erre by Gods infinite wisdom; that if pinched by his Contradictions he awake and open his eyes, he may presently behould *the beauty and glory of this unspotted spouse of the lambe, the Virgin-Mother of Christians*, and so be moued to lay downe his (a) head, and the Vnicorne's horne of his singular Wit, *in the lappe of her Communion*; choosing to be rather taken captiue by voluntary subiection to her Truth, then shewed a thrall of errour, in the chaines of insoluble Contradictions against himselfe.

14. In citing his testimonies I haue been exact & punctual euen to a line; and to set downe formally, fully and largely *his wordes, and whole discourses*; more perhaps then some may thinke necessary or fitting: but I had rather be found faulty for *excesse* in sincerity, then for defect. Yea the wordes that were vpon some occasion cited before, I haue, when in other occasiōs I make vse of the same, repeated them againe at large, for the Readers greater ease, not to bind him to seeke for them in the place of the former citation. I haue quoted not the *Pages*, but the *Chapter, Number, & line* of the number, that so the quotations may be common both to the first, & second Edition which agree in *Chapters, Numbers and lines*, but not in *Pages*. Yet sometimes when the numbers are long, I haue quoted the page and the line of the first

The Preface.

11

first Edition in the text; of the second in the margin.

The Chapters of the booke be these following.

1. That Christian fayth is not resolved finally into natural wit and Reason, but into the Authority of the Church.

2. That Christian fayth is absolutely certaine and infallible.

3. That the current of Christian Tradition is incorrupt, both in the fountaine, and in the streame.

4. That the Scripture is not the only Rule.

5. That the Church is infallible in all her Proposals of fayth.

6. That all Protesters against the Church of Rome, are Schismatiques.

7. That they are also Heretiques.

B 2

An

An Aduertisement to the Reader.

THis Treatise, Good Reader, was to the last word and syllable thereof, finished, reviewed, and ready for the Print longe since, euen in April of this yeere 1638. so that it might haue been printed, and published, and haue come to thy sight in the last Trinity Tearme, but for the tempests and stormes of warre, which infested ultra-marine Countries neere vnto England, and were nowhere more boisterous then ouer that place, where this Treatise should haue been pressed into the light. For this thundering noise of Mars frighted workemen, and droue them away into other calmer coastes, and afterward brought sharpe and longe sicknesse, both on the Printer and Authour, which hath been the cause it commeth so late vnto publique view. I hope this remissnes, and tardity will be recompenced, and satisfied by ensuing speed and diligence, in deliuering vnto the world other Treatises, which haue been also longe since ready for the Print, against this cunning and close Vnderminer of Christian Religion, whiles he pretendes to be an opposer but of the Catholique Roman.



The Church conquerant ouer Humane Wit.

*That true Christian fayth is not finally resolved by
naturall Wit, and Reason, but by the Churches
Authority.*

CHAP. I.



CH R I S T I A N resolution about
belieuing the mysteries of our *fayth*, *Cap. 1*
(as you also note) standes vpon two *n 8.*
Principles: The one, *Whatsoeuer God*
reueales for true, is true; or, which is the
same, The word of God is certaine
truth. The other, *The articles of our fayth*
are reuealed of God. About the truth of the first Principle
we are fully and abundantly resolved by the Autho-
rity of God Reuealing, who can neither be deceiued
himselſe, nor deceiue vs. The question is, by what
meanes may *Christians* be ſure, that the articles of
their Religion are the *word of God*. *Catholiques* make
their laſt resolution into the word of God *unwritten*,
deliuered by vniuerſall Tradition evidently credible
for it ſelſe; or (which is all one) into the authority of
the Church, deliuering what by the full conſent of

Christian Catholique Ancestors she hath received frō the Apostles. *Protestants* resolve to rest finally on Scripture, which (as they pretend) by the cleere beames of its owne light, sheweth it selfe, and the sense they make thereof, to be Diuine supernaturall Truth, and consequently the word of God. *You*, agreeing nether with the one nor the other, both reiect resolution by the inward euident certainty of Scripture as a fond conceyt; and also banish the infallible authority of the present Church, as an intolerable vsurpation: & so finally you come to rest vpon the iudgment and choyce of naturall Reason, pretending that euery man and woman in the choyce of their Religion, must at last follow their owne best wit, vnderstanding, and discourse. In which conceit you are not constant, you contradict it often; yea you are so vncertaine and vnsetled in all your discourses, as you say nothing in one place, which you do not in some other place vtterly deny. The discovery of this your perpetuall iarring and fighting with your selfe, is the marke this Treatise aymeth at: wherby it will appeare whether you had reason to write as you do in the conclusion of your worke, *Though the musick I haue made be dull and flat; and euen downe right plaine-song; yet your curious and Criticall eares shall discover no discord in it.* I hope together with this discourse the finger of our Sauour will enter into the deafe eares of your soule, & open them to discerne the perpetuall iarring of your voyce with it selfe, and also make you see, that it will be alwayes so, except you giue ouer singing the canticke of our Lord in the high strayne of quauering, and wauering diuision from the Church, according to the crochets of your owne conceyt; and fall to the plaine *Gregorian Ecclesiasticall tune*, humbling your Treble-wit to sing the base

Mar. c.
7.

base, in the lowest note of subiection to the Holy Catholique Church,

The first Conuiction.

2. **T**HIS Conuiction is grounded on this contradicting your selfe, that cap. 2. n. 3. in fine, you say, *The Scripture is the sole iudge of controuersies, that is, the sole rule to iudge them by; those onely excepted, wherein the Scripture is the subiect of the question, which cannot be determined but by naturall reason, the only principle besides Scripture which is common to Christians.* To the contrary, cap. 2. n. 153. you write: *Vniuersall tradition is the Rule to iudge all controuersies by: & Preface n. 13. to the Directours assertion, That if the true Church may erre in defining Canonickall Scripture, then we must receiue Scripture, either by the priuite spirit, or by naturall wit and iudgment, or by preexamination of the doctrine contayned therein; you answer: Though the present Church may possibly erre in her iudgment touching this matter, yet haue we other directions besides either of these three, and that is the testimony of the Primitiue Christians.* Thus you consider what sweet harmony and concent there is betwixt these two sayings; *Controuersies wherein Scripture it selfe is the subiect of the question, cannot be determined but by naturall reason, the only principle besides Scripture comon to Christians: The controuersy which Scripture is canonickall (wherein Scripture it selfe is the subiect of the question) may be decided for Christians affirmatiuely, by another principle or direction besides naturall wit and iudgment, to wit by the testimony of the primitiue Church, or by tradition which is a rule to iudge all Controuersies by.*

3. If you reply, that the question, which Scriptures be canonickall, is indeed determined by the testimony of the primitiue Church, but not only by it without the

the concurrence of *naturall reason*; this euasion is stoppt by what you write *cap. 2. n. 27. lin. 26. The question whether such or such a booke be Canonickall Scripture, though it may be decided negatively out of Scripture, by shewing apparent and irreconcilable contradictions betweene it and some other booke confessedly canonickall; yet affirmatiuely it cannot be decided but only by the testimony of the ancient Churches.* Behold the controuersie wherein Scripture is the subiect, cannot be decided affirmatiuely by any rule or principle, but by tradition only, that is, by the testimony of the ancient Church, a rule distinct from that of *naturall wit and iudgement.*

4. You will say, yea you do say, that Tradition though a principle distinct from reason, yet is not able to stand by it selfe, without the support of *naturall reason, cap. 2. n. 31. Though Scripture be a principle most knowne in Christianity, yet this is not to deny, that Tradition is a principle more knowne then Scripture, but to say, it is a principle not in Christianity but in reason, not proper to Christians but common to all men.* And *cap. 2. n. 114. You would haue men follow authority; on Gods name let them; we also would haue them follow authority. for it is vpon the authority of vniuersall Tradition, that we would haue them beleue the Scripture.* But then, as for the authority you follow, you will let them see reason, why they should follow it. And is not this to goe a little about, to leaue reason for a short time, & then to come to it againe, and to do that which you condemne in others? It being indeed a plain impossibility to submit reason but to reason: for he that does it to authority, must of necessity thinke himselfe to haue greater reason to beleue that Authority. Thus you. And though you often iterate this falshood, that tradition is not rested

sted vpon for it selfe, but proued by reason; yet you do as often inculcate the contrary truth that it is a principle euident of it selfe, independently of any reason besides that credit it hath of it selfe. *Cap. 2. n. 155. The Scripture* is not an absolutely perfect rule, but as perfect as a written rule can be, which must alwayes need something else, which is evidently true, or evidently credible to giue attestation to it, and that in this case is vniuersall Tradition; so that vniuersall Tradition is the rule to iudge all controuersies by. *Cap. 2. n. 25. lin. 3.* We be- lieue not this (*the bookes of Scripture to be canonicall*) vpon the authority of your Church. but vpon the credibility of vniuersall tradition, which is a thing credible of it selfe, and therefore fit to be rested on. *Cap. 4. n. 53. lin. 26.* you say, That *Charity* maintayned, though he differ from *D. Potter* in many things, yet agrees with him in this, that tradition is such a principle as may be rested on, and requires no other prooffe.

5. By these later texts of cleere Truth I conuince the fallshood of the former, that Tradition vniuersall is not a principle in Christianity but in reason; nor proper to Christians but common to all men. How can tradition vniuersall (that is deriued from the Apostles by the full consent of all former Christian ages to this present) be a rule to determine all controuersies amongst Christians; and yet not be a rule in Christianity, but in reason only? And whereas you say, That tradition is a principle not proper to Christians, but common to all men; I wonder, what mist of disaffection against this truth could be so thicke betweene your vnderstanding and it, as to hide it from your sight. Is not tradition vniuersall frō the Apostles, a rule of beliefe proper to Christians, that is, for Christians only? Do any men in the world but Christians be-
C lieue

lieue Doctrines to be true Institutions and Lawes , holy and pious , because they are deliuered as such by full consent from the Apostles ? who but *Christians* admit *Scriptures* to be the word of God , because receiued from the Apostles , by tradition as such ? How then is not Apostolicall tradition a principle *proper to Christians* , but *common to all men* ? You will say , Infidels also be- lieue the tradition of their Ancestours , and so tradition is a principle which Christians haue common with them. I answere in like manner , Infidels be- lieue the Scriptures and writings of their ancestours ; will you then say , that Apostolicall Scripture is not a principle proper to Christians , but common to all men ? If not , I hope then you will easily vnderstand , that though prophane tradition be a principle with Infidels , yet Apostolicall tradition may be , & is a principle proper to Christians.

6. The Principle whereby you proue , that the authority of *Tradition* is resolued into Reason , because , *It is impossible that any man should submit his reason but to reason , for he that does it to authority , must of necessity thinke himselfe to haue greater reason to be- lieue that authority.* This principle I say , is not onely false but impious : For according to it it is impossible , that any man should be- lieue the mystery of the most blessed Trinity , except he haue greater reason to be- lieue it , then the authority of God reuealing it. For if he haue not , then he submits his naturall reason not vnto reason , but vnto the authority of God , reuealing things farre aboue the reach of reason.

7. I conclude the principall intent of this Chapter with a demonstration from your contradictions , that with Christians the authority of Apostolicall tradition

is not a principle in reason, but of Christian faith above Reason, able to command Reason to believe, even what may seeme repugnant to reason. You affirme, that in Scripture there are many irreconcilable contradictions to the seeming of reason. *ca. 3. n. 19. In all the controversies of Protestants, there is a seeming conflict of Scripture with Scripture.* And *cap. 1. n. 13 lin. 26. The contrary believe* may be concerning points, wherein Scripture may with so great probability be alleaged on both sides, that true louers of God and truth, may without any fault some goe one way, and some another, and some (and those as good as either of the former) suspend their iudgement and expect some *Elias* to reconcile the repugnancies; Now reason cannot but feelee much difficulty and repugnance, to believe a book full of seeming contradictions to be *the word of God*, and to containe nothing but infallible truth. And yet all true Christians (and you professe with them) do vpon the authority of Tradition believe *Scripture* to be Gods word, & euery word & syllable thereof to be infallible truth, notwithstanding all the seeming contradictions, which most of Christians know not how to compose, but must expect some *Elias* to reconcile them: Ergo they hold (and you professe to hold) Tradition as a Principle above reason, and so high in authority above it, as it is able to command reason to believe, what to the seeming of reason cannot possibly be true. Thus by your owne contradictions the resolution of faith, that Scriptures be the word of God, is conuincd to rest finally not on Reason, but on Tradition, a Principle superiour to all human Reason.

The Church Conquerant
The second Conviction.

AS the text of holy Scripture, so likewise the sense thereof is proved to be Divine, and true; not because congruous and conforme to the *rule of natural Reason*; but because deliuered by Tradition vnwritten. This truth I am to make good by your sayings, wherein you contradict your selfe, leauing the victory to that part of your contradiction which standes for the Catholique side.

8. *Cap. 2. n. 1. lin. 24.* you reprehend the Roman Church: Because *we settle* in the minds of men that the sense of Scripture is not that which seemes to mens reason and vnderstanding to be so; but that which the Church of *Rome* declares to be so (*by tradition vnwritten*) seeme it neuer so vnreasonable, and incongruous. Your saying contradictory of this, and whereby this may be refuted, you deliuer some three pages after, to wit, *Cap. 2. n. 8.* (k) *Though a Writing* could not be proved to vs to be a perfect rule of faith, by its owne saying so (for nothing is proved true by being sayd, or written in a booke, but only by tradition, which is a thing credible of it selfe): yet it may be so in it selfe &c. By this saying the former is proved to be false, that the Scripture is to be vnderstood according to the *seeming of mans reason*, and not according to *Tradition*, or doctrine *vnwritten*. If nothing be proved true by being written in a booke, but only *by Tradition vnwritten*, then no doctrine, or sentence is proved true because written in a booke of Scripture, according to the iudgment of mans vnderstanding; but only because deliuered by Tradition as diuine doctrine & the true sense of Scripture: Consequently not Scripture vnderstood according

(k) *Lon.*
Edit. p.
ss. n. 8.

ding to human sense and reason, but Scripture vnderstood in the sense of perpetual tradition from the Apostles is the rule of Christian truth and fayth.

9. This you also suppose, *preface n. 12.* Where you say, That, *Discourse guiding it selfe only by the principles of Nature, is by no meanes the guide of Christian fayth in the vnderstanding of Scripture, and drawing consequences from it, but the rule is right Reason grounded on diuine Reuelation.* Now right Reason not guided by the principles of Nature, but by the light of diuine Reuelation, is not natural wit, nor human vnderstanding, but diuine & supernaturall sense, and Reason. Nor can our Reason precededently vnto Scripture, be grounded on, and guided by the light of *Diuine Reuelation written*, as is cleere. Ergo the rule to proue any doctrine to be Diuine truth, is not Scripture vnderstood according to mans vnderstanding, according to the light of natural Reason, but Scripture vnderstood according to the wiledome of God, knowne by the light of Diuine Reuelation vnwritten, to wit by Tradition, which is (you say) *credible of it selfe.*

10. This resolution of Fayth finally and lastly not into natural Reason, but into *diuine Reuelation vnwritten*, is gathered from the laying of S. Peter: *No prophesie of the 2. Pet. 1. Scripture is made by priuate interpretation; for not by the will 20. of man Prophecie came in at any time, but holy men of God spake inspired by the Holy Ghost.* This discourse of S. Peter is demonstratiue, and may be reduced to this syllogisticall forme. The Scripture cannot be interpreted by any spirit, wit, or mind inferiour to that from which it did originally proceed. For an inferiour spirit, as is the naturall wit and spirit of man, is not able so much as to 1 Cor. 2. *conceau the thinges of God; Yea that which is wisedome* 14.

with God is folly with men: But all holy Scripture proceeds originally from the spirit, wit, and mind of God: *Ergo*, it is not to be interpreted, that is, the sense thereof is not to be iudged true or false, by the seeming of naturall reason, or wit, but by the spirit and wisdom of God, which spake in Christ Iesus and his Apostles, the found of whole voyce hath been by perpetual tradition continued, and conueyed vnto the present Catholique Church.

11. Nor do you *pag. 95. lin. 1.* sufficiently excuse your course of Resolution frō being *private interpretation* condemned by *S. Peter*, where you say. *Is there not a manifest*
 „ difference between saying, *the spirit of God tels me, that*
 „ *this is the meaning of such a text* (which no man can pos-
 „ sibly know to be true, it being a secret thing) and bet-
 „ ween saying, *these and these reasons I haue to shew, that*
 „ *this is the meaning of such a Scripture?* Reason being a pu-
 „ blique and certaine thing and exposed to all mens trial
 „ & examination But if by *private spirit* you vnderstand
 „ the particular reason of euery man, your inconuenien-
 „ ces (*against resolving by the private spirit*) will be reduced
 „ to none at all. Thus you, vnderstanding by *private*, a thing
 that is hidden, *secret, insearchable, not exposed to the sight*
and examination of all. But this notion of *private* is against
 the meaning of *S. Peter* in this place; because in this
 sense, euen the *Holy Ghost* is *private*, the true sense of
 Scripture is *private*, because hidden and secret, not to be
 discerned, nor iudged by the *naturall man.* *S. Peter* then
 by *private interpretation*, vnderstands interpretation
 made by *private men*, who haue no publique authority,
 nor power to command in the Church of God. Now
 your *particular reason* (*I William Chillingworth haue this*
 reason, that this is the meaning of such a Scripture) is
private.

pruate, not endued with publique authority, nor with any right to command *pruate men* to submit their *pruate* reason and iudgment vnto yours. Ergo, your rule of interpretation (*I william Chillingworth haue these reasons for this sense*) is *pruate*, and cōsequently of no authority in Gods Church. I adde, that *interpretation by the pruate spirit*, that is by the spirit of God speaking in *pruate men*, is not so abhorrent, and exorbitant from truth, as yours, by the naturall wit of euery man. For extraordinarily it may fall out that, that may be the true sense of Scripture, which is taught by the Holy Ghost vnto some *pruate* and particular person; but it is impossible that, that should be the true sense of Scripture, about the mysteries of fayth, which seemes reasonable and congruous to human vnderstanding; because the wisdom of God reuealed in Scripture seemes folly vnto *the natural man*. So that of necessity in many texts of Scripture, that must be the true sense, which seemes vnreasonable, & incongruous to mans naturall vnderstanding.

12. I must here finally note, that in saying, *that Scripture is not proued to be a perfect rule by its owne saying so; for nothing is proued true by being said or written in a booke, but only by Tradition: you singe out of tune*, so high in the prayse of Tradition, and so decry Holy Scripture, as euen our Catholique eares will not endure it; except the harsh sound thereof be allayed and tempered by some reasonable restriction, to wit, *that nothing is proued by being written in a Booke*, as by the last principle, or prooffe whereon our persuation doth rest. I feare Protestants will be offended at this your speech, and iudge your Booke in respect of this Blasphemy worthy of the fire. For verily your wordes (as they sound) make Scripture
no

no rule, or principle of fayth at all, but cleerely disannull, and make voyd that so frequent Protestant argument *Scriptum est*, it is written, it is Scripture. For how can this argument be of any force, if nothing be proued true, because written in a booke, but only by tradition? The best fauour I can do you, is to shew Protestants a place of your Booke, where you contradict your selfe about this assertion. For this may perchance pacify them, to wit. cap. 4 n. 53. lin. 23. *A man belieuing the Scripture to be the word of God, must of necessity belieue it true: and if he belieue it true, he must belieue it contaynes all necessary directions vnto eternall happinesse, because it affirms it selfe to do so.* Behold Scripture proued a perfect rule by its owne saying so, and not only by tradition.

The third Conuiction.

13 **Y** Our conceit of resolving by reason & discourse, implyeth a double blasphemy; first by your owne contrary sayings it is proued to imply, that God requires of men impossibilities, *Preface nu. 12.* If by discourse you meane right reason grounded on diuine Reuelation, and common notions, written by God in the Hearts of all men, and deducing, according to the neuer-fayling rules of Logicke, deductions from them: if this be it you mean by discourse, it is meete, and reasonable, and NECESSARY, that men, as in all their actions, so especially in that of greatest importance, the choyce of their way to Happinesse be left vnto it. And in saying this, I say no more then S. Iohn to all Christians: *Deerely beloued, Belieue not euery spirit, but try the spirits, whether they be of God or not:* I say no more then S. Paul, in exhorting all Christians to try all thinges, and to hold fast that which is good: then S. Peter, in commanding all

all Christians to be ready to giue a reason of the hope, that is in them: then our Sauour himselve in forewarning all his followers, that if they blindly followed blind guides, both leaders and followers should fall into the Ditch: and againe in saying euen to the People, *Yea, and why of your selues, iudge ye not what is right?*

14. But are all men able to do this, able to giue a reason of their fayth by the rules of logicke? Experience sheweth, and you confesse they cannot *cap. 6. n. 10. l. 10.* I could wish with all my part, as *Moyse* did, that all the Lords people could prophesy, that all that belieue the true Religion were able (according to *S. Peters* iniunction) to giue a reason of the hope in them &c. But should I affirme, that all true believers CAN DO SO, I suppose it would be much against experience, and modesty &c. Thus you grant that all Christians, are not able to giue a reason of their fayth; and yet you say, that this is commanded vnto all Christians vnder paine of falling into the ditch, that is, of being damned. What is consequēt hereupon? That your doctrine, that true fayth is finally resolued into human reason, that all men and women that will be saued must be able to be their owne iudges, able of themselues to iudge of so many Religions and different pretended wayes to Heauen, which is the right, This your doctrine is (to vse your owne wordes against your selfe) *iniurious to God & man, robbing God of his goodnes, and man of his comfort, making God a Tyrant exacting of men what he knowes they cannot doe, and causing man to be desperate, seing he cannot be saued, but by doing thinges which to him are impossible.*

Oxf. edit. pag. 18. n. 26. l. 29. Lond. edit. cap. 2. n. 26. pag. 18. l. 11.

15. Secondly your way of resoluing by reason, by your contrary sayings, is proued blasphemous against Iesus Christ, making him (O vild impiety!) a blind and

D

false

false Prophet. You say, he foretold and forewarned all his followers, that if they blindly followed blind guides, both leaders and followers should fall into the ditch, of damnation. And yet else where you say that millions of his followers, who blindly and imprudently believe vpon the word of their father, or Maister, or Minister, haue true faith & are saued *cap. 2. n. 49. lin. 18. There are millions amongst you* and vs, who believe vpon no other reason, then their education, and the authority of their Parents and Teachers &c. And will you proscribe from Heauen all those believers of your owne Creed, who do indeed lay the foundation of their Faith no deeper, then vpon the authority of their Father, or Maister, or Parish Priest &c? What if their motiue to believe be not in reason sufficient? Do they therefore not believe what they do believe? They choose their Faith imprudently perhaps, but yet they do choose it; vnlesse you will haue vs believe, that is not done which is done: because it is not done vpon good reason &c. Wherefore you must for shame recant this fancy when you write againe, & suffer true faith to be many times where your Churches infallibility has no had *in the begetting of it.* Behold how earnest you are to proue many millions of Christs followers, who believe vpon no good reason, but blindly follow their blind & fallible leaders, a father, a maister, a Minister, haue true faith, and are saued, consequently that our Lords forewarning, that *if the blind follow the blind, both shall fall into the ditch,* is not true.

16. Thus you make our Lord, (which I haue hor-
 rour to think) a blind prophet, out of your owne dam-
 nable blindnes. For our Lords saying is most true and
 infallibly certaine, *that if the blind lead the blind, both shall
 fall into the ditch;* but your doctrine is blind and impi-
 ous,

ous, that the Catholique Church as a *blind guide*, and many times they that follow it *follow a company of beaſts*. Nor is it true that many of ours haue true Chriſtiā faith of the Creed, who belieue vpon no better authority then the word of a Father, or Maſter &c. For how can they belieue the Creed (whereof one article is *the holy Catholique Church*,) without apprehending better authority to belieue, then the bare word of a Father? If they want diſcretion to conceaue the notion of *the holy Catholique Church*, they want vnderſtanding to belieue actually, and ſo are ſaued by Habitual faith: but if they apprehend what is meant by *the holy Catholique Church*, the Churches authority concurs to the begetting of faith in them together with the illumination of Gods ſpirit, making them to apprehend more deeply and diuinely of the thing, then otherwiſe naturally they could by ſole Church propoſition. You hauing made it *neceſſary vnto ſaluation*, that men do not blindly follow blind guides, but that by their owne wit and reaſon euery one chooſe and frame to himſelfe his Religion, being his owne caruer & iudge: hauing (I ſay) layd this ground, you ſhould in conſequence haue maintayned, that ſuch as ignorantly and blindly follow a blind Church fall into the ditch and are damned. But now making it the word of God, *that the blind following the blind muſt needes periſh*, and yet labouring to ſaue ſome blind followers of the blind, your ſelfe are fallen into blaſphemy by following your owne blind diſcourſe, which ſtill through want of light ſtumbles at euery ſtep, contradicting it ſelfe.

The fourth Conuiction.

17. **Y**OU contradict your ſelfe againe about ſimple and ignorant Chriſtians, whome you terme

Fooles In one place you teach, they cā hardely be saued,
 in another that they cannot erre from the way of Sal-
 uation, vnlesse they will. The first you affirme pag. 96.
 lin. 12. *For my part, I am certain, God hath giuen vs reason
 to discerne between truth and falshood, and he that makes not
 this vse of it, but belieues thinges he knowes not why, I say, it
 is by chance, and not by choyce, that he belieues the truth; and
 I cannot but feare, that God will not accept of the sacrifice of
 Fooles.* Thus you. The second in plain and direct con-
 tradiction of, this you deliuer (p) pag. 221 lin. 17. saying
 (p) Se. of your safe Way to Saluation; *This is a way so plaine as
 cond. edit. pag. 212. fooles, except they will, cannot erre from it.* Now by Fooles
 lin 5. in matters of Religion you vnderstand such as want
 strength of vnderstanding, and wit, to iudge by them-
 selues, and to discerne truth from falshood, in mattets
 of Religion and controuerfies moued by Heretiques
 against the Church. How then it is true *that Fooles can-
 not misse of the way of Saluation except they will,* if such only
 be saued to whome God hath giuen such reason and
 vnderstanding, that of themselues they be able to
 discerne truth from falshood in matters of fayth con-
 trouerted betwixt Heretiques and the Church? If
 God will not accept of the sacrifice of Fooles, that is,
 their deuout obedience vnto the doctrine which they
 belieue to be his vpon the word of his Church,
 without knowing any other why; your word that *Fooles
 cannot erre from Saluation vnlesse they will,* is so farre from
 being true, as the contrary is true they cannot be saued
 though they would neuer so fayne.

18. Your two sayings are cleerely and mainely oppo-
 site the one to the other, the first being false, and the se-
 cond true: For it is *against experience and modesty* to say
 as you do, that God *hath giuen vs, that is, all Christians*
 reason

reason to discern truth from falshood in the controuersies of Religion. No man liuing can do this, by the reason giuen him of God, without relying for his assurance on the authority of Gods Church. Yea your selfe, though you much presume of the goodnes of your vnderstanding and excellency of your wit, haue not reason inough for this, which I conuince by what you write Cap. 3. n. 19. lin. 19. *Where there is a seeming conflict of Scripture with Scripture, reason with reason, Authority with Authority; how it can consist with manifest reuealing of the truth I do not well vnderstand.* What is, I do not well vnderstand, but as if you had said, God hath not giuen me vnderstanding and reason to discern assuredly Christian truth from Hereticall falshood in the controuersies about Christian Religion, where Scripture, reason, authority are seemingly alleaged on both sides? as in the controuersies betwixt the Roman Church and your Biblists and Gospellers (namely *Arians* and *Socinians*) they are. And if you haue not sufficient vnderstanding and reason to *discerne truth from falshood* about the fundamentall article of Christianity, the *Godhead of Christ*, how hath God giuen all Christians reason to frame an assured iudgment of discretion about this, and all other fundamental points debated betwixt any kind of your Protestants and vs?

19. The other part then of your contradiction is true, *that Fooles cannot erre from the way of Saluation except they will*, because God will without doubt accept of the sacrifice of their humble deuotion firmly to belieue what they haue receaued from the Church as his Word. For you say c. 5. n. 64. lin. 20. God requires no more of any man to his Saluation, but his true endeavour to be saued: But *Fooles*, that is such as want

strength of vnderstanding to discern Truth from Falshood in the Controuerſies, about Religion, the best they can do to belieue aright and be ſaued, is to reſt on the word & tradition of the Church, without asking her Why ſhe teacheth this or that Doctrine: For what can they do better? You will ſay, let them *ſearch the Scriptures*, and looke into the writings of the primitiue Fathers. Firſt being ignorant men and of meane capacity they cannot do it; and when they haue done it, how can they be the wiſer, ſeing (x) you

(p) c. 12. 8. 2. ſay, *nothing is proued true, becauſe written in a booke, but only by Tradition which is credible for it ſelfe?* And to what purpoſe to goe from the Church, and her tradition for a ſhort time, and then preſently to come to it againe? For euen as the Dove departing from the Arke of Noe, not finding where to ſettle her foote in ſuch a deluge of waters, returned inſtantly to the Arke; ſo mans reaſon leauing the Churches Authority to find by Scripture which is the true Religion in the vaſt deluge of contrary wauing Doctrines, will meeete with nothing wheron he may firme his beleefe, and ſo will be forced, for reſt and aſſurance, to fly backe to the Arke of Gods Church.

(a) *Eſay. c. 35. v. 8. Via ſan-cta voca-bitur & hac erit directio, via, ita ut ſtulti nō errent per eam.* 20. Addē that the truth of your ſecond aſſertion, that the way of Salvation in the Law of Grace is ſo plain, that (a) *fooles cannot erre from it*, was foretold by the prophet *Eſay*, and he giueth the reaſon thereof, becauſe they ſhould haue a viſible Teacher or (b) Maſter, & ſhould heare his voyce behind them, laying, *This is the way, walke therein.* From this truth I conclude that euery man and woman is not to reſolue for his beleefe by his owne reaſon but by the voyce of the Church. Becauſe in the way of Wit and Diſcourſe, according to the rules of

Logick

Logick, Fooles may erre against their will as not being able of themselues to discern assuredly betwixt sauing truth, & damnable falshood gilded with many seeming cleere texts of Scripture. But the true way of Saluation euen fooles cannot erre from it, except they be willfull against the teaching and voyce of the visible Church telling them *this is the way, walke therein; Ergo*, the way of belieuing simply the voyce of the Church, is the sole way of Saluation; and your way of Wit and proud Disdayne of the Church, is the way to the bottomlesse pit.

The fifth Conuiction.

21. **Y**OUR way of resolving your fayth by reason is refuted, because by this meanes you may be forced vnder paine of damnation, to admit the Diuel himselfe to be your Maister, & bound to receaue his false suggestions as the word of God. What absurdity more *immane*, vast, & horrible then this? And yet it doth so necessarily follow vpon your foresayd Doctrine as you are forced to grant it, *cap. 2. n. 12. lin. 22.* *If by the Discourse of the Diuell himselfe, I be (I will not say conuincd, but) persuaded though falsely, that it is a Diuine reuelation & shall deny to belieue it, I shall be a formal (though not a materiall) Heretique.*

22. You will perhaps say I do you wrong, and mistake your meaning: For you do not meane that you are bound to belieue any falshood proposed vnto you by the Diuel in *persuasive*, or *conuictiue discourse*, but onely if you haue belieued vpon the Diuels persuasion any thing to be Diuine Reuelation, you cannot, this supposed, disbelceue it, or thinke it to be false. I answer, the drift

drift of your discourse sheweth this could not be your meaning; and if it were, the same is proved (by your owne confession) sottish. In that place you discourse vpon a difficulty debated betweene *D. Potter*, and the *Maintayner of Charity*, what is required to sufficient pro-

(a) *D. Pot.* position obliging men to beleue? *D. Potter* (a) thinkes
 pag. 247. that to be sufficiently proposed as Gods Word, which
 (a) Be it is proposed by seeming euident prooffe from Scripture,
 by a whosoever the Propounder be. The *Maintayner* iudgeth
 Prea- sufficiency of Proposition to depend, not so much on
 cher, or the seeming clarity of Scripture, as on the Authority of
 lay man, the propounder, that he be worthy of credit, and such an
 or rea- one, as on his word and proposition we may securely
 ding rely. You take part with *D. Potter*, & affirme, that what
 Scrip- is proposed by good and sufficient prooffe, by conui-
 tures, or ctive, or perswasive discourse as the word of God, is suf-
 hearing them read, that a ficiently propounded vnto fayth, though the propoun-
 point be der be the Diuell himselfe: *Be the means of proposal what*
 cleared to him. *it will, sufficient or insufficient, worthy of credit or not wer-*
thy, though it were the discourse of the Diuel himselfe; yet if
I be (I will not say conuincd, but) perswaded, though falsely,
that it is a Diuine reuelation, and shall deny to beleue it, I
shal be a formal (though not a material) Heretique. These be
 your wordes which shew euidently your mind to be,
 that men are bound to beleue the Diuel himselfe, if his
 discourse be sufficient, that is, conuictive, or euidently
 probable and perswasive.

23. For the sense, that if you were perswaded by the
 Diuel, that it is a diuine Reuelation, & yet should refuse
 to beleue it to be true, *that then you should be a formal He-*

(u) Se- retique, this sense is idle and sottish, not formall herely
 cond edi- tion pag. but plain impossibility, as you say (u) Pag. 10. lin. 12. How
 10. lin. 2. is it not apparent contradiction, that a man should disbeleue
 what

*What himseife vnderstandes to be a truth, or any Christian
What he vnderstandes, or but belieues to be testified by God?
D.Potter might well thinke it superfluous to tell you, This is
damnable, because indeed it is impossible.*

24. Moreouer, this obligation of belieuing the Diuels
Discourse and Conference, if it seeme to you to be con-
uictiue, or perswasive, is necessarily consequent vpon
these your principles, 1. *That proposition sufficient doth not
depend on the authority, of the propounder, but only on the
apparent goodnesse, or seeming euidence of his dis-
course.* 2. *That he who followes God only and his owne reason
cannot possibly erre.* 3. *That by discourse no man can possibly
be led into error.* For all men are bound to belieue that
to be the word of God and infallible truth, which they
iudge sufficiently propounded as such. But you iudge
that sufficiently propounded, which is propounded by
conuictiue or perswasive discourse from Scripture, *who-
soeuer the propounder be, though he be the Diuel himseife.*
Therefore you are by your principles bound to belieue
euen the Diuel himseife when his discourse to you see-
meth conuictiue or perswasive; as *Luther* did, and by
diabolical perswasion was induced to *abrogate the Masse.*
This being so (that your way of resolution bindeth you
to belieue the Diuels discourse) I subsume: But in the
true Christian way of resolution, none can be bound
to belieue the Diuel, when he knows him to be the Diuel:
Therefore this your *Wit*-way of resolution of fayth, is the
right way to make the Diuell the ruler & guide of your
wit. You say (y) *Pag. 357. lin. 13. That our Diuels at Le- (y) Se-
den doing tricks against the Gospell shall not moue you. I am cond E-
persuaded the Diuell will not giue so much as a false dit. pag.
miracle for your soule, seing he may haue it at an easier 340. lin.
rate. For he can easier frame an hundred arguments of 22.*

convictive discourse from Scripture in the behalfe of his falshoods, that is, such as you with all your wit shall not be able to solve; then do such *tricks* as he is said to be forced to do at *Lowden*. And yet you do not aske so much as a *convictive* Argument for your soule, if he can by probable reasons from Scripture hammer into your head, that his doctrine is diuine reuelation, you are sure his owne.

The first Conviction.

27. **VV** Hereas the Directour offers you the *perpetuall visible Church*, descended by *never interrupted succession* from our Saviour, for your guide instead of your natural wit and reason, you reiect the offer Preface n. 12. saying: He that followeth reason in all his opinions, followeth God, whereas he that followeth a company of men, may oftentimes follow a company of beasts. And against the Catholique Romane Church thus you declame Cap. 6. n. 72. If I follow your Church for my guide, I shall do
 „ all one, as I should follow a company of blind men in a
 „ iudgment of colours, or in the choyce of a way: For
 „ euery inconsidering man is blind in that which he doth
 „ not consider. Now what is your Church, but a compa-
 „ ny of vnconsidering men, who comfort themselus, be-
 „ cause they are a great company togeather; but all of
 „ them, either out of idelnesse refuse a seuerer trial of their
 „ Religion, or out of superstition feare the euent of such
 „ a triall, that they may be scrupled and staggered by it,
 „ &c. You are a company of men vnwilling, and afraid
 „ to vnderstand, lest you should do good; that, have eyes to see,
 „ but will not see; that, haue not the loue of the truth, and ther-
 „ fore desirous to be giuen ouer to stronge delusions: men that
 „ loue darknesse more then light: in a word you are, the blind,
 „ leading

leading the blind. Thus you; And this is the *flat downe*
right plain-songe you promised your reader without any
discords in it; for it is iust that tune of concord, and har-
monious concent which scoldes vse to singe when
they rayle at some modest Matrone. You will I trust
find by experience, that we are not all such Cowards,
blind men, and beasts as you make vs; you will see that
considering we haue considered your Babylon with
lights, and haue bene bold to enter into the darkeſt cor-
ners, and dennes of your booke, and find your Lions
to be but of the *Cuman* kind. Will not you say, I haue
made a diligent and *seuer* search into your booke, if I
can out of it produce two propositions, which ioyned
together conclude in good forme against your head,
what I am loath to vtter, worse blindnesse then you
object to vs, wheras the present Church is not capa-
ble of such folly?

26. None can belieue contradictions at once, but such
as are *Fooles*, and haue their braynes crackt. This you sup-
pose Cap. 6. n. 33. lin. 14. *unlessse* you will say, that they (*S. Au-*
stin and the African Bishop) were all so foolish as to belieue
direct contradictions at once. And c. 5. nu. 105. lin. 40. (a) 2. E-
Who can ioyne together in one brayne not crackt 292. n. *dit. pag.*
these assertions, *In the Roman Church there are errors not* 105. lin.
damnable: In the Roman Church there are no errors at all? 40.
And (b) Pag. 10 lin. 12. *It is an apparent contradiction,*
That a man should disbelieve what himselfe believes to
be a truth. And (b) Cap. 5. n. 59. *That a man who is per* (b) 2. E-
suaded, that your Church doth erre in these things *dit. pag.*
should together believe these things true, is implicatio in 10. lin. *a*
termini, as Schoolemen speake, a contradiction so plaine,,
as one word destroyeth the other. Thus you: and yet,,
that foolery, that men may believe contradictions at once, n

(d) 2. E. you affirme, and proue it by your owne experience (d)
 dit. pag. Pag. 215. lin. 3. *Though there can be no damnable He-*
 206. lin. rely, vnlesse it cōtradict some necessary truth, yet there
 6.

is no contradiction, but the same man may at once be-
 lieue this Heresy and this Truth: because there is no
 contradiction, that the same man at the same time
 should *believe contradictions*. Thus you: wherein you ma-
 nifestly contradict your selfe and practise what you
 say, no man can do whose braynes be not crakt: For
 what contradiction can be more plaine & direct then
 this betwixt your two sayings, *It is no contradiction, that*
a man believe contradictions at once, the same doctrine to be
heresy and truth. It is apparent contradiction so plaine as
one word destroyeth another, that the same man at the same
time should believe contradictions, or should believe that
to be Falshood which he believes to be Truth.

27. No man therefore in his wits can believe contra-
 dictions at once, only *cracks brayns* can thinke they do
 it, when they do it not; as mad-men imagine they fly
 when they rest in their bed. In which number you
 ranke your selfe, *Cap. 4. n. 47. Indeed that men should not*
assent to contradictions I willingly grant; but to say it is impos-
sible, is against euery mans experience; and almost as unrea-
sonable, as to do the thing which is said to be impossible. Thus
 you: that other men besides your selfe believe, or think
 they believe in their heart contradictions at once you
 cannot say, but only by the experience you haue of
 your selfe, that you do in your conceyt hartily believe
 contradictions, and therupon imagine that other men
 doe the like. Now put together your two assertions:
 Whosoever thinketh he can believe contradictions at
 once is a foolish creature, hath his brayne crackt: *I*
William Chillingworth know by experience, that I can
 believe

believe contradictions at the same time. What of this! O that you would conclude what these premises urge you vnto. Therefore I will neuer more trust my owne wit and discourse in matters of religion; I wil abandon these false principles, *He that followeth his owne discourse still followeth God: By discourse no man can possibly be lead into error*: I will take the Church for my guide which is constant in the truth and cannot oppose herselfe, as I my selfe confesse.

28. For so you do, (f) Pag. 33. lin 9. *It is impossible the Church should oppose the Church, I meane the present Church oppose it selfe.* Now seeing men are *naturâ mendaces*, mutable, subiect to error, to change and to be contrary to themselves, *this impossibility of opposing it selfe*, which you attribute to the Church must of necessity be acknowledged to be a Diuine priuiledge, caused by the continuall assistance of the spirit of Wisdome, in whom and his doctrine there is not *est*, and *non est*, as the Apostle sayth. Hence I conclude the infallibility of the Church: You say, Pag. 215. lin. 29. *that he that belieues the Bible, and together belieues some errors against the Bible, contradicteeth himselfe, believing contradictions at once*: But it is impossible, you say, that the present Church should oppose and contradict it selfe: Therefore it is impossible, that the present Church believing the Bible should hold any error against the Bible.

29. Except perchance you will say, that the Church can do things impossible, as you say your selfe can: In prooffe wherof I giue one instance instead of many. Your aduersary vrgeth you often, & hard to set downe a Catalogue of your *Fundamentals* of fayth: You after many tergiversations say at last, (h) Pag. 201. lin. 25. *To set downe a catalogue of Fundamentals (because to some more*

is fundamentall, to others lesse, to others nothing at all) had bene impossible. And (i) Pag. 134. lin. 25. This variety of circumstances makes it impossible to set downe an exact Catalogue of fundamentalls, and proves your request as unreasonable, as if you should desire vs to make a coate to fit the Moone in all her changes. Can you make this impossible Catalogue of the Fundamentalls of your Church, that is a coate for the moone in all her changes? Yes surely you say you can (k) Pag. 160. n. 53. lin. 25. I could give you an abstract of the essential parts of christianity if it were necessary, but I haue shewed it not so, and at this time I haue no leisure to do you courtesies so troublesome to my selfe. Thus you. Nor will we request you to do vs courtesies impossible, which are (I confesse) troublesome things to be done, and the doing of them requires time longer then Eternity: only we will beseech you as you tender the good of your soule, to do a courtesy to your selfe very possible to be done; That you will reflect, that you, being a man witty, and brought vp in learning, it were not possible you should fall into such contradictions as these are, were not the hand of diuine permission therein for the cure of your capital euil, which is, Confidence in your owne wit, and contempt of the whole Catholique Church as of a company of only blindmen and beasts. It is not weaknesse of wit, but dizziness of pride which makes you thus reele in your writing, as euen here you do againe. You auerre, that to some more is fundamentall, to others lesse, to others nothing at all. Which is not only against D. Potter but your selfe haue in your booke contradicted it (I am sure) more then twenty times; as Cap. 3. n. 20. lin. 9. Points fundamentall be those only which are reuealed by God, and commanded to be prach't to all, and to be beliened of all. If fundamentall points be those only which are to be preacht

(i) 2. E-
dis. pag.
129. l. 15.

(k) 2. E-
dit. pag.
164. l. 21.

(b) D.
Potter p.
311.

preacht vnto all, and to be believed of all, how is it possible, that there should be some points fundamental for some only, and not for all?

The seauenth Conuiction.

30 **VV**ith this Conuiction I meane to conclude this first Chapter, and answere your chiefe argument against our *grounding* Fayth on the authority of the Church: for (say you) the infallibility of the Church, the Principle we build on, is *not euident of it selfe*, and therefore needeth prooffe. It cannot be proued by *tradition*, because none can be shewed for it; nor by *Scripture*, because the *Scripture* is receaued vpon the authority of the Church, and so the Church must be believed infallible before we believe *Scripture*; wherefore it cannot be proued by *Scripture*, except we will runne round in a circle, saying, We believe the *Scripture* to be Canonical, because the Church which is infallible sayth so, and, We believe the Church to be infallible, because the *Scripture Canonical* sayth so. To get out of this circle, we must say, that we believe the *Scripture* to be the word of God, because the Church infallible in all her proposalls doth so affirme, and the Church to be infallible we believe, because our natural reason guided by the motiues of credibility, and *prudential motiues*, doth persuaide vs that it is so. This argument (by the repetition whereof your booke is growne into a great bulk) I could answere by retorsion, and shew that you are forced to dance the round in a circle, though many times you runne in and out, by contradicting your selfe. But I will not goe so far about, I answere directly, that the Church may be considered, either as *deliuering Traditions* receaued from the Apostles, or, as *defining*

See con-
uict. i. n.
7.

fining Controuersies of fayth which for the present arise. The infallibility of the Church as deliuering Traditions is not proued by Scripture, nor by tradition, but is *eident of it selfe*: for the authority of the Church deliuering Traditions by liuely voyce is *nothing else, but the authority of vniuersall tradition; which Autherity you graunt to be evidently credible of it selfe, and fit to be rested on*. And on what principle can *Christian Fayth* rest, but on that which is infallible, by relying wheron we cannot be deceaued?

31. You are a man so courteous and kind to the Church of *Rome*, as for her sake you will deny your selfe; you will destroy your owne writing, you will grant this infallibility of the Church in plaine termes to do her a pleasure. *Cap. 2. n. 44. lin. 6. There is no repugnance, but we may be certaine inough of the vniuersal Tradition of the ancient Church &c. and not certaine inough of the definitions of the present Church. vnlesse you can shew (which I am sure you neuer can do) that the infallibility of the present Church was alwaies a Tradition of the ancient Church.*

(a) *Cap. 4. n. 53. l. 24. Tradition is such a principle as may be rested on, and which requires no other prooffe.* *fallible, not so much in consigning ancient traditions as in defining emergent controuersies. Thus you. In which words I note how you shuffle and imply, in saying: We cannot shew tradition for the infallibility of the present Church, for tradition is a liuely voyce to be heard, and believed of such as haue eares to heare, not a thing of sight to be shewed in books. Do not you say, nothing is proued true by being written in a booke but only by tradition (of liuely voyce) which is credible for it selfe? Why then do you require prooffe of that, which you say nedeth (a) no prooffe? And how can you deny the tradition for the infallibility of present Church against emergent Here-*
sies,

sies, seing it is consigned to her Children by the present Church which you do not deny to be infallible in consigning ancient traditions? It is true, you do not in this place make vs of this truth an absolute deed of gift; you are afrayd, it goes something against your heart, but you will be presently more kind-hearted For in the next *Cap. 3. n. 45.* you speak thus to your aduersary. *You were to proue the Church infallible, not in her Traditions (which we willingly grant if they be as vniuersal as the tradition of the vndoubted bookes of Scripture &c. not therefore in her vniuersall traditions were you to proue the Church infallible) but in all her decrees and definitions of Controuersies.* Behold now you grant willingly, and with all your heart, that the present Church is *infallible in her vniuersall Traditions*, but not in all her definitions. With this your grant we remaine content for the present, and for the grant of the second, we shall expect your leasure, for you will grant it in the end, as shall be shewed in the 7. Chapter.

32. This grant of the Churches infallibility in deliuering Traditions, you confirme vnto vs, by the authority of *S. Austine cap. 3. n. 43.* For to his testimony brought by *Charity mantayned, That which the whole Church holds, and is not ordained by Councils, but hath alwaies been kept, is most rightly belieued to be deliuered by Apostolicall authority;* you answer: *Very right, and what then? therefore the Church cannot erre in defining of Controuersies?* Thus you; and then you fall to skoffe at your learned Aduersary, saying, *You are at your wits end to find some glue, or soder, or cement, or chaine, or thred, or any thing to tye together the Antecedent and the Consequent of his Enthimemes: and so with him, when he writes againe to write nothing but syllogismes.* I belieue what you say, that in writing thus

scornetully and crakingly, you were at your witsend, that is, at that end of your wit you prefixed vnto it, when you vndertooke to answer *Charity mantayned*. For it appeareth by your vntaught, & base manner of answering, that your end was only by petulant abusing the modesty of the Authour, to obscure as much as you might, the cleere truth of that excellent Worke. So you doe here forging an *Enthimeme* he neuer thought on, making a conclusion which he did not intend to proue in this place; and yet, would you turne your wit the right way, and vse it to that end for which God bestowed the same on you, you would easily find a proposition, which doth tye the *Antecedent* and *Consequent*, euen of this by you so scorned *Enthymene*, with an vnsoluble knot.

33. But to my purpose you grant with S. *Austin*, that *Whatsoeuer the whole Church holds and deliuers not as a thing ordayned by Councils, but as alwaies kept, is most rightly believed to be an Apostolical Tradition*, so that the testimony of the present Church in deliuering traditions is credible, and most worthy to be belieued for it selfe without

(p) Edit. other preface: and (p) pag. 119. n. 12. you say S. *Austen* sayes, pag 113. that Christ hath recommended the Church to vs for a credible n. 163. li. 26. Witnesse of ancient Tradition, not for an infallible Definer of all emergent Cotrouersies: which supposed, I would know how with this truth, that can consist which you write

(q) 2. E. (q) Pag. 63. lin. 30. The truth is, that neither the Scripture, dis. p. 61. nor the present Church hath any thing to do in this matter, lin. 1. for the question which be Canonical bookes cannot be decided, but only by the testimony of the ancient Church. How hath the present Church nothing to do in deciding the question, which be canonical bookes, if her testimony be infallible in this matter? if herein she do the part of a credible

ble witnesse? Haue you any glue, or sodder, or cement, or chayne, or threed to tye these your two sayings together? Or rather haue you any chaine to kepe them asunder, that they come not to fight, and mutually to murder ech other? Also what you say (r) *Pag. 152. lin. 147. lin. 1.* *(r) 2. E- dit. pag.* 44. Who can warrant vs, that the vniuersall Traditions of the Church were all Apostolical &c. who can secure vs, that human inuentions might not in a short time gayne reputation of Apostolique? how doth this agree with what you say in the next lines after Cap. 3. n. 45. That the Church in her vniuersall Traditions, is as infallible as Scripture? Do not you also affirme, That Tradition vniuersal is the rule to iudge all Controuersies by credible for it selfe, & fit to be rested on? how can this be true if we can haue no warrant, no security, but that the vniuersal Traditions of the Church may be false and forged, not deliuered by the Apostles, but à quocunque traditore, inuentions of men? and if there be no warrant, but that vniuersal Traditions may be false, what warrant is there, that you haue the true vncorrupt text of Scripture, not depraued by the secret creeping in of damnable errours? Do not you say Pag. 55. n. 8. that these bookes cannot be proued Canonically, but only by Tradition? and cap. 2. n. 114. It is upon the authority of vniuersal Tradition that we would haue men to believe Scripture. If then vniuersal Tradition be fallible, if there be no warrant, no security of the certainty therof; how are you secure, that you haue the true text of the true Canonical bookes of Scripture? But of this more in the next Chapter.

34. By what hath bene said your so often repeated, yea perpetuall and only argument of the circle, is shewed to be friuolous, and you running about therein haue made your head so dizzy, as you forget your selfe. For

in arguing you alwayes presume without any prooffe, that the infallibility of the present Church deliuering Traditions, or which is all one, that the credibility of the vniuersal Tradition of the Church, *is not euident of it selfe*. A supposition which you neuer would haue presumed, had not that bene out of your mind which you often affirme and confirme, that the authority of vniuersal Tradition, *is euidently credible of it selfe*, and *fit to be rested on*. No lesse vnproued, yea more worthy to be reprov'd is your other (b) presumption, *that we do not so much as pretend, that there are certaine euident notes to know the true Church*, and discerne it from all others, nor that it is euident of it selfe, that those notes agree only to our Church; all men will wonder how you could be so ignorant, or not being ignorant, how you would be so bold. For who doth not know we teach, that the Church is knowne by visible markes euen euident to sense, as succession, Vniuersality, and Vnity; and that these markes do shine manifestly and conspicuously only in the Roman Christianity. Which truth is a necessary sequele of your doctrine, *That tradition vniuersal is the rule to iudge all Controuersies by, fit to be rested on, and euidently credible for it selfe*. Behold the deduction therof.

35. That Church only is the true christian Church which hath vniuersall Tradition of Doctrines *euidently credible for it selfe*. This is cleare, because if Tradition *credible of it selfe* be the rule to iudge all Controuersies by, and the only meanes to know which be *Canonickall Scriptures*, then the Church which wants Tradition *credible of it selfe*, wants the fundamentall Principle, and ground of all Christianity, and so cannot be the true christian Church; But that Church only hath Tradition

of doctrines, credible of it selfe, whose Tradition of Doctrines is evidently perpetuall by succession from the Apostles, evidently vniuersall by diffusion ouer the world, evidently one and the same in the mouth of all the reporters therof. For Tradition which is not perpetuall from the Apostles, but hath a knowne after-beginning wants credibility that it is Christian: Tradition which is not vniuersall and notorious to the whole world, but clancular, and in a corner wants credibility that it is from the Apostles, and the sound of their vniuersall preaching: Tradition which is not one and the same, but dissonant in the mouth of diuers reporters wants credibility that it is from truth, and not a deuise of human fiction, or of deceiued discourse from Scripture: Ergo the Church, whose Tradition is evidently credible of it selfe must be evidently perpetuall, by succession from the Apostles: Vniuersall by the notorious preaching of her Tradition diffused ouer the world One and the same, and vni-forme in all her Professours, so that they all agree in the beleefe of all doctrine deliuered vnto them by the full consent of Tradition. For they who of Traditions deliuered by full consent choose some, and reiect others, are Choosers, that is Heretiques. Nor can such Choosers choose, but there will be amōgst the variety of choyce, and consequently dissension, wherby they will appeare a company voyd of all authority and credit to testify what is the true Christian Tradition from the Apostles. These be the markes wherby the true Christian Catholique Church is knowne, which to be found in the Church of Rome only, shall be shewed in the sequent Chapter, though I cannot but presume the thing is to euery considering man eident inough. Wherefore Catholiques, and all true Christians do not choose their

Church or Religion by their owne naturall reason & and witt; but *Tradition* notorious, and euident of it selfe, Perpetuall, Vniuersall, Vniforme shewes them the Church, and with her, and in her that Religion which was for them chosen; or dayned, deliuered *by the wisdom of Christ Iesus, brought by him from the bosome of his heauenly Father.* You see then that in granting Tradition to be the ground of all Christian beliefe, you haue grāted as much as we can desire, and (howsoeuer you be pleased to terme vs *unconsidering men*) yet we haue considered the sequels of your assertions, perchance more deeply, then you haue done your selfe.

That



That the assent to Gods Word of Christian saving Faith, is not meere human, morall, and probable; but Divine, infallible, and certainly unerring.

CHAP. II.

THE contrary errour cozen german to the refuted in the former Chapter, & consequent therupon, is often inculcated by you in your booke; That an infallible faith (a) is not necessary vnto (a) Cap. 6. n. 6. saluation, nor for our waiking vnto happineise, through a world of oppositions backt by (b) Cap. 1. n. 8. the strength of flesh and blood. A weake probable and credible assurance, that there is an Heauen sufficeth, *versus* *finem.* though (b) vndiscernable from the beleefe we giue to (c) Cap. 6. n. 5. 28. other human hystories. It is inough men beleue the Gospell, and mysteries of faith, (c) as much as *Cesars* (d) *Pre-Commentaries*, or the history of *Salust.* That men are not *face n. 8.* bound, nor is it possible they should beleue (d) thinges *in fine.* impossible in human reason. (e) That we should beleue (e) Cap. 6. n. 7. 118. the truth of any thing, the truth whereof cannot be *fine.* made

made euident with euidence proportionable to the degree of faith required of vs, this for any man to be bound to, is vniust, because to do it is impossible, *As sure as*

(f) *Cap.* God is good he will not require impossibilities of vs; but (f) 6. n 7. infallible certainty of a thing which though it be in it selfe, yet is not made to appeare to vs to be infallible *circa me-* certaine, *diam.* is an impossibility. These and the like nullifidian Padoxes you often vtter, and endeauour to proue, which are plausible and applauded by those *S. Peter* termeth *vnllearned and vnstable* heads, who now passe

(g) *Nam* vnder the name of *Gallant wits*, whose life we may feare *vra Re-* is futable to the leuity and vanity of their Faith; *ligio*

omnino *Nam quæ venustas hic adest Gallantibus?*

sine gra- *Quæ casta vestis?* —————

ui Au. These doctrines (I say) be welcome to such as groane *thoritat* vnder the (g) yoke of humble obedience to Gods word; *imperio* vnder Christian duty of believing things inuisible, *iniri rectè* the *reuealed manner* whereof is incomprehensible to humane *nullo pa-* understanding, who because they find difficulty to do it, *Epotest.* will not endeauour by Gods grace to rayse their erring, *August.* and wandering thoughts, and stay them by firme and fixed faith, on high and heavenly objects. For as (h) *S. Leo* *Cred.* faith, it is the vigour only of generous mindes to belieue *Cap. 9.* without doubt what comes not within sight, and there to rest *(h) Ser.* with our heart, whither we cannot reach with our eye. And *2. de As-* because you accuse Catholiques, that they require men *consione.* to yield, vpon only probable & prudentiall (1) motives, *(i) Pag.* (1) most certaine assent to thinges impossible in human *79. n. 70.* reason; that the falshood of this slander may be made *Vpon* apparent, I must briefly declare our Catholique do- *pruden-* *tiall mo-* *tines,* *fallible* *and vn-* *certaine* *error.* *grounds*

The first Conuiction.

2. **T**O the constitution of an assent absolutely infallible, five things concur, all which by the consent of Catholique Deuines are most certaine and infallible in the assent of Christian faith. 1. The *Object*, with is doctrine reuealed of God. 2. The *motiue*, and reason of belieuing which is the Authority of God revealing whole veracity is altogether infallible. 3. Because we believe *Reuelations* not made immediately to our selues, but to the blessed Apostles, it is necessary there be a *Proponent* of Gods word, that is a *Witnesse* worthy of all credit, an Authority whereon we may securely rely, that those Christian doctrines were deliuered and preached by the *Apostles* as Diuine Reuelations. This *Proponent* and *Witnesse* is the present Catholique Church, deliuering what she receaued by full vniuersall tradition from her Ancestours, or (which is the same in effect) *vniversall Tradition*. Now we hold tradition to be altogether as infallible as Scripture, and that it ought to be receaued with the same reuerence, with the same submissiue deuotion of pious beliefe, as Scripture, as you acknowledge that we do. *chap. 2. n. 1.*

3. Fourthly, that an assent be infallible it is necessary, that the thing believed, be represented and proposed to the Vnderstanding of the believer in *such manner*, as he may know the same to be infallible, and that in belieuing it, he cannot possibly erre. For the *manner* of belieuing, if it be not knowne to the believer to be infallible, though it be infallible in it selfe, will not make him sure and infallible. This condition is found in the assent of Christian fayth; for the things to be believed are represented as cleer by noted and marked *with diuine*

G

and

and supernaturall proofes, that is, confirmed with innumerable manifest miracles, which the believers haue seen with their eyes, or else know them by the report of whole worlds of those that beheld them, by report so full constant & brim as it is equiualent to the euidence of sense. These Diuine proofes and markes euidently shew, that the things marked with them, are vnder the speciall care of God and of his infinite goodnesse, that he cannot but prouide, that the pious believer be not deceaued about them.

4. Hereby is concluded, that the *Christian manner* of apprehending the mysteries of faith is infallible, & more sure and certaine then any *manner* of naturall representation, and apprehension of things can possibly be. Naturall knowledge is eyther *Physicall*, whereby we apprehend things as true, because represented as such by the euidence of sense; or *Metaphysicall*, whereby we apprehend things as true, by the light of vnderstanding, which cleerly beholds the necessary connexion the thing apprehended hath with truth. As in this proposition, *Euery whole thing is greater then any single part thereof*, our vnderstanding, by the notion of the single wordes, presently without discourse sees and belieues the truth of the speech. Neyther of these representations is so certaine & infallible, that it implies contradiction that men should be deceaued by it, eyther by some extraordinary working of God to men vnkowne, or through the infinity of the thing apprehended, which men cannot comprehend. For example, men see the Chymnies of a Towne smoake, thence they conclude with *Physicall* certitude, that there is fire in those Chymnies; wherein they may be mistaken, seing God may haue rayfed that smoake without any fire. We are better assured, by the
light

light of vnderstanding about vniuersall principles, which appeare manifestly true, by the very notion of the single wordes; yet not so vniuersally sure, but we may be deceaued by them about infinite and incomprehensible thinges. That Principle I before named, *Every whole thing is greater then any single part thereof*, we are not sure thereof in infinite whole thinges; yea many learned men do maintaine, that in an infinite multitude, the whole multitude is not greater then a single part thereof. That knowne rule and principle of all discourse, *The thinges with be one and the same with a third thing, are one and the same betweene themselves*, Fayth assures vs, that the same fayles in the diuine Nature, which being infinite and incomprehensible, may be and is identified with three diuine Persons really distinct. Nor is this to destroy all certitude of naturall knowledge, but only to make the same finite, and limited within the compasse of its weake reach and capacity, infinitely inferior to diuine wisdom, and altogether subordinate to his most infallible word.

5. Now deception cannot possibly happen in our belieuing of doctrines represented to our vnderstanding, cleerly marked with euident miracles and other supernaturall notes, shewing they are reuealed of God. For God working by his power aboue nature to mooue men to belieue such Diuine and miraculous doctrine, cannot also worke aboue nature what may be the cause of our deception therein: for then he should be contrary to himselfe, with is altogether impossible. Nor can there be feare, danger, or possibility, that in this beliefe we may be deceaued through weaknesse of iudgment, caused by the finite capacity of humane wit, because in this beliefe the light of naturall reason

is not our guide, but the word of God discovering high mysteries and hidden secrets conforme to his infinite and vndeceivable vnderstanding. Hence a late learned Writer our Countryman sayth excellently to this purpose, (a) *That the motives of Christian Catholique credibility are most certaine and infallible in themselves, and do most manifestly, and euen with metaphysicall evidence conuince our Christian Catholique Religion to be the true way of saluation, as certainly, as that there is any true religion in the world, or any diuine prouidence about the saluation of mankind.* Who can desire greater certitude, and evidence then this?

(a) P.
Thomas
Baconus
South-
ellus in
sua Re-
gula vi-
na seu A-
nalyfi fi-
dei. Dif-
pat. 3.
cap. 6. n.
122.
Hæc
motiua
conuin-
cunt ne-
cessario
& meta-
physice,
quod si
vlla vera
fit in
mundo
Religio
& ea
alia esse
non pos-
sit quam
hæc no-
stra his
motiuis
infigni-
ta.

6. The fifth thing is firme adherence to the doctrine proposed, so that the believer cannot at all, or else very hardly be driuen from his persuation of the truth thereof. This adherence in Christian Catholiques is so firme, that they are ready not only to giue their life in testimony thereof; but also will deny their owne senses, their reason, and all naturall evidence, rather then admit any doubt of doctrine in this manner, represented to them as Gods infallible word.

7. If any object, that the assent of Christian fayth, is often shaken with doubts, sometimes ouerthrowne; whereas the assent of naturall knowledge stands constant and vnmoued without danger of falling: I answer, this is true, but the reason hereof is not because the assent of naturall knowledge is more certain and firme of it selfe; but because Christian fayth, is more exposed to the blasts of temptation. An Oake, on the top of an high mountayne is shaken with wind and storme, and many times beaten to the ground; whereas a tender sprig growing low out of the wind is not subiect to this danger; yet no man will say, that the sprig is
more

more firme and deeply rooted in the ground then the Oake! Christian fayth standeth on high hauing for matter and subiect, high inuifible and incomprehensible mysteries, which though they are by the belicuer sufficiently seene to be reuealed of God; yet not seene at all by naturall reason to be true in themselues; yea still in themselues they remaine darke, obscure, difficill, and seemingly impossible in humane reason. Hence though fayth be firmly grounded, and deeply rooted on the authority of God reuealing Christian doctrines, yet stronge apprehensions of the seeming impossibility thereof, like violent blasts cause the same sometimes to shake & wauer with inuoluntary doubts: whereas the assent of naturall knowledge is neuer, or seldome tempted to doubt, because there is no seeming impossibility in such truth. By this explication of our Catholique Resolution of fayth, it is manifest, you haue done vs wronge in saying, that we require, *That men build a most certaine assent on fallible, uncertaine, and only probable groundes.*

The second Conuiction.

8. **Y** Our ground to make the assent of Christian fayth *fallible*, and only probable, is because it is an assent to a conclusion deduced from two premisses, whereof the one is fallible and only probable: *Cap. I. n. 8. lin. 28. Our fayth is an assent to this conclusion: „ The doctrine of Christianity is true, which being deduced „ from the former Thesis, All which God reuealed for true, „ is true, which is metaphysically certaine; and the former „ Hypothesis, All the articles of our fayth, are reuealed of God, „ whereof we can haue but morall certainty, we cannot „ possibly by naturall meanes be more certaine of it, then „*

„ of the weaker of the Premises; *for the conclusion still fol-*
 „ *lowes the worser part, (if there is any worse)* and must
 „ be negative, particular, contingent, or but morally cer-
 „ taine, if any of the propositions from whence it is deri-
 „ ued be so. Neither can we be certaine of it in the highest
 „ degree, vnlesse we be thus certaine of all the principles
 „ whereon it is grounded. As a man cannot stand, or goe
 „ strongly if either of his legs be weake, or as a building
 „ cannot be stable, if any one of the necessary pillars be
 „ infirme and *instable*. Thus you; And then to shew, this
Hypothesis, All the articles of our fayth, that is, all the do-
ctrines of the Christian Creed and Scripture be reuea-
led of God, to be only morally certaine; you bring this rea-
son, because it is proued only by tradition vniuersall, only
by the testimonie of the ancient Churches, an argument only
probable. Cap. 6. n. 40. The ioint tradition of all Apostolique
Churches, with one mouth, and with one voice teaching the
same doctrine, was urged by the Fathers, not as a demonstra-
tion, but only as an argument very probable. Cap. 6. n. 8.
Tradition of Christian doctrine from age to age, from Father
to sonne cannot be a fit ground but of morall assurance. Cap. 3.
n. 44. lin. 55. Who can warrant vs that the vniuersall Tradi-
tions of the Church were all Apostolicall. Thus you.

9. This is your discourse to proue your Paradoxe,
 that the assent of Christian fayth is fallible and only
 morally certaine. But the foundation wheron you
 build your maine Principle, *Vniuersall Tradition is not in-*
fallible, you your selfe ouerthrow, and establish the con-
trary ground that tradition vnwritten is as infallible as
Scripture. Cap. 4 n. 13. lin. 19 Vniuersall and neuer-
fayling Tradition giueth this testimony both to the Creed and
Scripture, that they both by the workes of God were sealed and
testified to be the word of God. Behold the Hypothesis, that
 the

the articles of Christian Religion (that is of the Christian Creed and Scripture) are reuealed of God, standes vpon a pillar firme, and neuer failing. If you say, *morally certaine*, and *neuer failing*, not *absolutely*; I reply obiecing vnto you another place where you expressely suppose your certainty of the Scripture to be absolute, to wit of those bookes of which there was neuer doubt made.

Pag. 69. *We do not professe our selues so absolutely and vndoubtedly certaine; neither do we vrge others to be so, of those bookes which haue been doubted, as of those that neuer haue.*

How cleerly and in expresse termes do you professe, that your certainty of the Scriptures that were neuer questioned, is not only probable and morall, but *absolute certainty vndoubted*. And how can it be otherwise, seeing *Tradition* by liuely voyce conueyeth vnto vs what the Apostles deliuered about the Canon of the Scripture, to wit, which bookes were to be held as the word of God. For no man can doubt, but the Apostles deliuered, what they had by diuine reuelation from Christ Iesus, and the holy Ghost; & consequently, that these bookes be the word of God, is a diuine reuelation vnwritten, as certaine as if it were written. For as D. (b) D.

Field (b) sayth, *It is not the writing that giueth things their authority, but the worth and credit of him that deliuereth, though by word, and liuely voice only.* Field of the Church
l. 4. c. 20.
pag. 238.

10. Perhaps you will tell me, as you do *Charity main- tain'd* vpon another occasion, cap. 2. n. 86. *If D. Field were infallible, and these wordes had not slipt vnadvisedly from him, this had been the best argument in your Booke.* Well then: I must, I see, bring an Authour *infallible* in prooffe, that Tradition is equall in certainty vnto Scripture, & one so *advised* as all Catholiques compared to his wisdom, be but a company of *blind vnconsidering men*. What if I find

find this Doctrine in your booke proued euen by the same argument *D. Field* vseth, because, *being written giues not Authority to God's word*, then I hope you will say without any if, that this is the best argument in my booke. But where is this passage to be found? Perchance if you were to find it your selfe, you would be to seeke, & more to seeke if you goe about to reconcile your *contradictions*. In which case you who vaunt your selfe for the witty *Oedipus* in soluing the Sophismes and *Knots of Charity maintayned*, will perhaps be at a stop, and be forced to say with *Oedipus* being to solue his owne riddle.

*Ego ille victa spolia qui Sphynxis tali,
Harebo * fati tardus interpres mei.*

* Scripti:

11. The place is *Pag. 153. n. 45.* where you speake thus to your Aduersary: *No lesse (say you) is S. Chrysostome for the infallible Traditions of the Church. But you were to proue the Church infallible, not in Traditions, which we willingly grant (if they be vniuersall as the Tradition of the vndoubted bookes of Scripture is) to be AS INFALLIBLE AS THE SCRIPTURE is. For neither doth being written make the word of God more infallible, or being vnwritten make it lesse infallible.* In these words you affirme, that *Traditions vniuersall*, namely and principally, that Tradition, that the vndoubted bookes of the Scripture be the word of God, are *as infallible as Scripture*. You proue it, because, *Neyther doth, being written, make the word of God more infallible, or being vnwritten make it lesse infallible.* In which prooffe you suppose that as Scripture is the *written word of God*, so Tradition is the *word of God vnwritten*, and therefore equall in certainty and infallibility to Scripture.

12. Now the ground of your error being by your
con-

contradiction thereof, and by your confession, yea by your *demonstration* of the contrary truth ouerthrowne, I proue the assent of Christian fayth to be absolutely certaine in this manner: Christian faith is an assent to this conclusion, *The doctrine of Christianity is true*. This conclusion is deduced from this *Thesis*, *Whatsoever God reueales for true is true*, and this *Hypothesis*, *The Christian Creed and Scripture be the word of God*. So that if both these propositions be *absolutely certaine*, then the assent to the conclusion is infallible and absolutely certaine. Now that both these Premises or Propositions be absolutely certaine I proue; The *Thesis*, *Whatsoever God reueales is truth*, you grant to be absolutely and metaphysically certaine: But the *Hypothesis*, *The Christian Creed, and Scripture is diuine reuelation, and the word of God*, is also absolutely certaine. First, because it is, as you grant, an vniuersall Tradition as infallible as Scripture. But Scripture is absolutely and metaphysically certaine truth, because it is doctrine reuealed of God. Secondly, whatsoever God reueales whether it be deliuered in writing or by liuely voyce only, is absolutely and metaphysically certaine: But the Tradition, *That the Creed and Scripture is the word of God*, is diuine reuelation which the Apostles deliuered by liuely voyce, *sealing and confirming the truth thereof with workes of God*, as you confesse: Ergo the Tradition, that the Christian Creed and Scripture is of God is absolutely certaine and infallible. Finally you say, *cap. 1. n. 8. in fine. If a message be brought me from a man of absolute credit by a messenger that is not so, my confidence of the truth of the relation, cannot but be rebated and lessened by my diffidence in the relatour*. This you. I subsume: But the message of the Gospel is brought to me and to euery Christian, from a man of absolute credit Christ

2. edition
cap. 2. n.
8. in fine.

Iesus the Eternall Sonne of God, in whome are all the treasures of Diuine wisedome by a messenger of *absolute credit*, to wit, by the Church, deliuering vniuersall Tradition, which is as you confesse as *infallible as Scripture*: Therefore our faith of the *Creed* and *Scripture* is not rebated or lessened by being deliuered by the perpetuall *visible Church of Christ*, but is as infallible, as if we had had the message immediatly from the mouth of our Lord and Sauour.

13. I adde, Tradition vniuersall is not only as infallible as Scripture, but also more certaine in respect of vs. This I ground vpon what you write *Cap. 6. n. 59. We must be surer of the prooffe, then of the thing proued thereby, otherwise it is no prooffe*, that is, the certainty of the prooffe must be better knowne and more euident to vs, then the thing proued. But *cap. 2. n. 8. you say, the Scripture cannot be proued to be the word of God, and a perfect rule of faith, but onely by Tradition, which is credible for it selfe. Ergo*, the certainty of Tradition is surer, that is, better knowne and more euident to vs then the Scripture. Yea further, Tradition is a Rocke of our beliefe, a Principle so euident, that it needes no further prooffe. This I proue by this argument grounded vpon your sayings; That which is credible for it selfe, and fit to be rested on, must be so euident, that it need no further euidence. This you suppose *Cap. 2. n. 45. lin. 8. where you say, I will neuer cease multiplying demaunds vpon demaunds, untill you settle me vpon a Rocke, I meane giue me such an answer, whose truth is so euident that it needs no further euidence*. But *Cap. 2. n. 25, lin. 5. you say, The credibility of vniuersall Tradition is a thing credible of it selfe, and therefore fit to be rested on. Ergo*, the Authority of Tradition vniuersall, or of the Catholique Church is a Rocke, a rule,

a reason of belieuing, so euident and credible of it selfe as it needes no further euidence.

The third Conuiction.

14. **VV**E haue conuincd your errour by the ouerthrow of the ground thereof: Now I proue the absolute infallibility of Christiã faith by the proper cause, shewing why it is so, and must of necessity be so, grounding my proofes on truthe so cleere, as they are by you granted. *Cap. 6. n. 9. lin. 2.* you say, *If we were required to belieue with certainty, (I meane a morall certainty) things no way represented, as infallible and certaine (I meane morally,) an unreasonable obedience were required of vs. And so likewise were it, were we required to belieue, as absolutely certaine, that which is no way represented to vs as absolutely certaine.* Thus you. Now I subsume. But the Articles of our faith are represented vnto you as absolutely infallible, not only as morally, but as metaphysically, and mathematically certaine in themselves. This I proue by what you write *Cap. 6. n. 3. lin. 6.* *I do heartily acknowledge and belieue, the articles of our faith be in themselves Truthe, as certaine, as the very common principles of Geometry, and Metaphysickes. But that there is required of vs a knowledge of them, & an adherence to them, as certaine as that of sense or science, that such a certainty is required of vs vnder paine of damnation, this I haue shewed to be an errour &c.* Thus you. Here you professe, that you do heartily belieue the articles of our faith to be in themselves truths altogether infallible, euen metaphysically certaine. But you could not belieue them heartily, as absolutely certaine Truth, were they no wayes represented to your vnderstanding as absolutely & metaphysically certaine. What more cleere then this? For how can you apprehend

hend that truth, by firme & hearty faith, which you do not apprehend at all? Or how can you apprehend that truth at all, with is no wayes represented to your vnderstanding? *Ergo*, the mysteries of Christian Religion are by the reasons and motiues of Christian Tradition represented to your vnderstanding, as truthe most certaine and infallible in themselves. How then are you not bound to believe them as Truth, absolutely and metaphysically certaine in themselves, with an hearty adherence to them, as certaine as that of sense and science? The mysteries of Christian faith being represented to you as morally certaine, you are bound (as our confesse) vnder paine of damnation to believe them with morall assurance: *Ergo*, if they be represented to your vnderstanding as truth absolutely certaine, you are bound to believe them with absolute certainty, equall to the certainty of mathematicall, and metaphysicall science. But they are so represented to your vnderstanding, and you heartily apprehend them as absolutely infallible in themselves.

The fourth Conuiction.

15. **I** conuince the absolute infallibility of Christian fayth by what you write *Cap. 4. 2. 11. lin. 20. Which of vs euer taught that it was not damnable eyther to deny, or to so much as doubt of the truth of any thing whereof we either know or believe, that God hath revealed it?* Thus you I do not know of what sect you are, and so I not say which of you, but I cā say, that you, of what Sect soeuer you be haue taught, that it is not damnable for men not to doubt of that doctrine which they believe to be revealed; for you accuse Catholiques, as blind, as peruerse enemies of truth, and of many thelike crimes, and in
 prooffe

prooffe thereof, you say. *Cap. 6. n. 72. lin. 15. My owne experience assures me, that in this imputation, I do you no iniury; but it is very apparent to all men, by your ranking doubting of any part of your doctrine, among mortall sinnes.* Here you reprehend our doctrine, that to doubt deliberately of the doctrine we believe to be revealed of God, is a mortall sinne, that is, damnable: for I hope your owne experience assures you, that we believe our Catholique doctrine, and euery part thereof to be the word of God written or vnwritten. With what reason and congruence then, can you reprehend vs for holding that it is a mortall sinne, to doubt of any part of our Religion, which we hold to be the word of God? Especially seeing you say, *Cap. 2. n. 122. lin. 12. That if you be perswaded by the Deuil though falsely, that it is diuine reuelation, you are bound not to disbelieve it vnder paine of formall heresy.* But to our purpose, we will take of your contradictions that part which is manifest truth, *that it is damnable to doubt of the truth of any doctrine we believe to be reuealed of God*, and then I dispute thus: There can be no more certayne nor stronger adherence to any doctrine, then that which is so firme, and vndoubted, as the believer esteemeth it damnable, and an heynous crime, so much as to doubt thereof. But this adherence to Christian doctrine you require as necessary, *damning all those that admit any voluntary doubt of the verity thereof: Ergo, an adherence to Christian doctrine most certayne, equall to that men giue to the principles of Metaphysicke, is required of Christians vnder paine of damnation, yea stronger adherence, teing a Christian is ready, and ought to be ready, to deny the principles of Metaphysicke, rather then doubt of Christian doctrine proposed to him as Gods*

word by perpetuall Christian Tradition. Finally it is vnreasonable that men should be bound vnder paine of damnation neuer to doubt of that doctrine, which is not so much as represented vnto them, as vndoubtedly and absolutely certaine. It is a burthen intollerable to maintayne a thing without any staggering and doubting, which is proposed only as probable and but morally certaine, against arguments which seeme demonstratiue and metaphysically certaine, and it is a condition very dangerous for men to liue vnder such hard or impossible lawes. But God doth not require of vs thinges vnreasonable, his yoke is sweet, his burthen light. *Ergo*, he hath prouided motiues which propose matters of fayth, as vndoubtedly and absolutely certaine.

The fifth Conuiction.

*Second
edition
pag 314.
lin. 27.*

16. **Y**OU set downe the principle wheron you rely in teaching the absolute fallibility of Christian fayth *Pag. 329. lin. 27. Had you made* the matter of fayth, either naturally or supernaturally eident, it might haue been a fittly attempered and duely proportioned obiect, for an absolute certainty naturall or supernaturall. But requiring, as you do, *an infallible certainty of a thing, which though it is in it selfe, yet is not made to appeare to vs to be infallibly certayne*, to my vnderstanding you speake impossibilities. And truly, for one of your Religion to do so, is but a good *Decorum*. For the matter of your Religion being so full of contradictions, a contradictory fayth, may very well become a contradictory Religion. Your fayth then, let it be a free, necessitated; certaine, vncertaine; eident, obscure; prudent, and foolish; naturall, and supernaturall; *unnaturall*

turall assent. Thus you, with a *Demosthenian* thunder of eloquence, discharge your bolts vpon our Church, without taking any pittie of a poore company of onely blind men, though some drops of *Xantippes* rayne come mingled therwith.

17. But your misery is a poore memory ; wordes be no sooner out of your pen, then out of your mind. For in other places you approue this very contradictory doctrine, which here you so fluently declame against. For though you say. *Pag. 330. lin. 14. That God cannot infuse a degree of certainty into our understanding beyond the degree of the evidence he giueth vs of the object* ; yet *cap. 6. num. 7. lin. 9.* you say to the contrary, *Well may we assent to a thing vnknowne, obscure, and vneident &c.* Could any wordes be inuented more directly repugnant to what you said before, that assent and evidence must correspond to ech other in degree; a probable assent must haue an object of eident probability; a certaine assent an object of eident certainty? Now you say absolutely, we may well, that is, not only possibly, but also easily assent to a thinge vnknowne, obscure, vneident; How doth this agree with what you say, *Cap. 6. n. 7. in fine. It is impossible. I shold belieue the truth of any thinge, the truth whereof cannot be made eident to me, with evidence proportionable to the degree of fayth required of me.* How contrary is this to what you say *Cap. 2. n. 154. lin. 6. Gods spirit, if he please may worke more, a certainty of adherence, beyond the certainty of evidence. But neither God doth, nor may require of vs &c.* And *cap 1. n. 9. lin. 43. The spirit of God being implored by deuout and humble prayer, and sincere obedience, may and will by degrees aduance his seruants higher, and giue them a certainty of adherence beyond the certainty of evidence.* Thus you, most directly

rectly against what you said before, that infallible certainty of a thinge not evidently certaine, is impossible; that if God infuse certainty into the assent of fayth, he must infuse also evidence into the object, and so make the object of fayth as visible and evident, as the assent of fayth is certaine. Which is now the contradictory Religion?

2. Edit.
pag. 315.
lin. 13.

18. And where you say that God doth not require of men more then they can do by themselves; and that the contrary were (you say, pag. 350. lin. 15.) as unreasonable, as to bind a man to goe ten miles an houre, on an horse that will goe only five, is impious, as disanulling all precepts of diuine and supernaturall actions. For why may not God require of a man, that is able of himselfe to goe only five miles an houre, that he goe tenne, moued by his hand: binding him not to resist, but to concurre with that his speciall mouing, aboue the strength of natural forces? And what Christian dares deny this to be required of all Christians, to wit, that they come vnto (a) Christ, and belieue in him, which yet is the worke of (b) God, & an act which the vnderstanding doth not exercise; but by the speciall motion, and (c) attraction of Diuine grace.

(a) come
vnto me
all.
Mat. 11.
28.
(b) This
is the
worke
of God
that
you be-
lieue.
(c) Ex-
cept my
Father
draw
him.

The sixt Conuiction.

19. **Y**OU affirmed in the prealleadged place of the former Conuiction, that our Catholike sayth is contradictory, free, necessitated; certain, vncertain; evident, obscure; prudent, foolish; naturall, supernaturall; vnnaturall assent. A declamation backt with no prooffe, childish fluent Rhetoricke,

Claudite iam riuos pueri. —————

I will make the same good vpon your selfe, and proue

proue you do attribute in direct termes these contra-
 dictious conditions to your witty witlese fayth. First you
 make it free, necessitated. That your fayth is free you
 say *c. 6. n. 7. lin. 16.* *It is necessary to fayth that the objects of* ^{2. Edit.}
it the points which we belieue be not so euidently certayn, as to ^{cap. 6. n.}
necessitate our vnderstanding to assent. That it is necessita- ^{7. lin. 16.}
 ted & enforced by euident reasons, you suppose *c. 1. n.*
9. lin. 15. God requires of all, that their fayth should be pro- ^{2. Edit.}
 portionable to the motives enforcing to it. Behold reasons ^{cap. 1. n.}
 enforce, that is, necessitate you to assent and so make it ^{9. lin. 23.}
 a free necessitated assent. Secondly euident, obscure: Eui-
 dent, because you say *cap. 6. n. 7. in fine.* That I should belieue
 the truth of any thing, the truth whereof cannot be made eui-
 dent to me, is impossible: Obscure, because you say, *Cap.*
6. n. 7. lin. 10. Well may we assent to a thing vnkowne,
 obscure, vneuident. Thirdly certain, uncertaine: most
 certaine and infallible, *cap. 3. n. 86. lin. 12.* Use the meanes, ^{2. Edit.}
 and pray for Gods assistance, and as sure as God is true, you ^{cap. 3. n.}
 shall be lead into all necessary truth. Heer you professe, that ^{86. lin. 12.}
 Christian Religion is the true necessary way to saluation;
 and that you are hereof as sure, as you are sure that God
 is true. Now I hope you are, and I am sure you professe
 to be (d) most vndoubtedly sure, that God is true. Ergo,
 you are most vndoubtedly sure, that Christian Religion ^{2. Edit.}
 is the true necessary way to heauen. For how can you ^{cap. 2. n.}
 assure others of that whereof you are not sure your
 selfe? And if this be so, then contrary to the ground of
 your impious error, you here professe certainty of ad-
 herence, beyond certainty of euidence. You say you are as
 certaine as God is true of Christian sauing truth; and yet
 I thinke you will not say, that the truth of Christian
 Religion is as euident to your vnderstanding, as it is
 euident that God is true. Your fayth then in this place is
 I most

most infallible; but in other places it standes vpon weake leggs, vpon Tradition which is fallible, vpon (e) onely probable motives. Fourthly, *Prudent, foolish*: Foolish because you say cap. 6. n. 10. many of yours belieue a right which are not wise. And cap. 6. n. 74. in fine *The imprudent fayth of Protestants may proceed from Diuine motion*. Is not this to say your Faith is *prudent, foolish*? *Prudent*, because they that follow it, goe to heauen and follow therein the spirit of wisdom. *Foolish*, because you say they be not wise, their belieuing is iustly (f) condemned of leuity and rashnesse (g) a foolish and imprudent action. Fifthly, your assent is *naturall, unnaturall*. *Naturall*, because (h) resolved by Logicke, finally determined (i) by natural reason. *Vnnaturall* because it cā (against nature, against the prime rule of natural reason & discourse) stand with the contradictory assent at the sametyme (l): your fayth I say, of this truth, *Christ is the eternall sonne of God*, with your beliefe of this *Socinian Heresy, Christ is not the eternall sonne of God*. Is not your fayth then *naturall, unnaturall; noble; base; Catholicke, hereticall; reasonable, unreasonable* all at once? Finally, *undernaturall, supernaturall*: which is proued by what you write Cap. 6. n. 62. Reason will conuince any man vnlesse he be of a peruerse mind, that the Scripture is the word of God, and then no reason can be greater then this, God sayes so, therefore it is true. From these words I gather first, that your faith of the Scripture is *undernaturall*, and inferiour in certainty to *naturall* reason; for you say, by *naturall* reason the same is conuincingly proued to be the word of God; but in the same Cap. 6. n. 60. you say, we must be surer of the proof, then of the thing proued by it: Ergo, your fayths certainty of Scripture is *under naturall* reason, and not so sure and infallible as your reason. And yet it is also *supernaturall* certainty because

(e) Cap.

2. n. 154

Highly credible but not infallible motives.

(f) Cap.

6. n. 9. in fine.

(g) Cap.

2. n. 49.

lin. 35.

(h) Pre-

face n. 12.

(i) Cap.

2. n. 3. in

fine.

(l) Pag.

215. lin.

4. & 2.

Edition

pag. 206.

lin. 6.

because you say, *no reason can be greater then this, God sayes so, therefore it is true.* And preface n. 2. pag. 2. lin. 14. I submit all other reasons to this one, God sayes so, therefore it is true. Now that *one reason* to which all other naturall reasons yield and submit themselues, must needs be *supernaturall* and superiour in certaynty to all *naturall* reason; so that I haue proued by your owne playne & expresse words, that your Religion of Wit is contradictory, free, enforced; euident, obscure; certayne, vncertayne; prudent, foolish; naturall, vnnaturall; vndernatural, supernaturall; wherby one may see, your assertion, that *Christian faith is not certayne and infallible, but onely highly credible*, what a mayne and mighty contradiction the same is, and what a world of grosse absurdities, and repugnances are inuolued therein.

The seauenth Conuiction.

20. **C** AP. 2. n. 154. lin. 8. you giue this reason why the assent of Christiā fayth is not certayne and infallible, and why God cannot require it of Christians, because, say you, *No man can giue, and so cannot be required to giue a greater assent to the conclusion, then the premises deserue.* And Cap. 6. nu. 7. ante finem, *Nothing is more repugnant then that a man shold be required to giue most certayne credit vnto that which cannot be made appeare most certayne credible.* But c. 5. n. 8. to the contrary you write, *Of this that we are to belieue Christian Religion, we are, & may be made infallibly certaine.* And c. 6. n. 9. *Arguments so credible that though they cannot make vs see what we belieue, yet they euidently conuince that in true wisdom and prudence the articles of it deserue credit, and ought to be accepted as things reuealed of God.* Thus you. And are you so dull as not to see how frō these your two sayings ioyned together in

discourse vild blasphemy may be concluded? The mysteries of Christian Religion cannot (you say) by the motiues of credibility be made certayne, or fit to be credited with infallible fayth. But the mysteries of Christian Religion can be made credible, and fit to be credited as things reuealed of God. Ergo things credible as reuealed of God, are not credible with infallible faith. And consequently to things reuealed of God a most certayne and infallible assent is not due. Is not this to deny the infinit verity and veracity of God and his word? Hence grounding vpon the contradictory I dispute in this manner. What we may & must belieue as the word of God, that we may, and must belieue with a most certayne and infallible assent; for nothing can be more certayne, and so nothing can more deserue to be vndoubtedly credited then the word of God. But we are (as you say) infallibly certayne, and arguments euidently conuince, that we may and must belieue the articles of our fayth as the Word of God, or as things reuealed of God. Ergo, we may, and we are bound by Christian duty to adhere to the articles of our Fayth with a most certayne, and infallible assent.

The eight Conuiction.

21. **I**N your Preface. n. 2. you say, I am most apt, and most willing to be lead by reason, alwayes submitting al other reasons to this one, God sayes it, Ergo it is so, This saying doth imply of necessity that the adherence of fayth vnto Gods word, is more certaine, then that of sense or any knowledge grounded on reason. Because if all other reasons must yeld & submit to this one reason, Gods saies it, therefore it is so, then this reason, I see this with my eyes; Ergo, it is so, must yeeld to this, God sayes,

it is not so, Ergo it is not so. But if the assent due to the word of God were not more certayn and infallible then that of sense, the conclusion from the euidence of sense were not to yield to the conclusion from the certainty of Gods word: *Ergo* by your owne profession you are conuincd to be false, in saying the adherence by fayth to the word of God, is not more certayne then that of sense; or else you cogge and dissemble to hide your infidelity, when you say, *I submit all other reasons to this one, God said so, Ergo it is so.*

22. Hence I further inferre that Christians ought, & you are bound to belieue, the mysteries reuealed in Scripture, though they seeme implicatory, and impossible to your human reason which you deny *Pag. 215. 2. Edit.*
lin. 16. For if all other reasons must yield to this one, *pag. 206.*
God sayes so, therefore it is so, then also this reason, The my- *lin. 18.*
steries of the Trinity, of Hypostaticall union of two natures in
Christ, of the Real Presence seeme manifestly impossible to
my reason, therefore they are impossible; ought to yield to
this reason, God sayth these mysteries are possible, and cer-
tainly true; Ergo they are possible, and certainly true. You
will say, that though this consequence be most certaine,
this is the word of God, Ergo it is most true, yet you can-
not be so certaine that this is the word of God, as you
are of that which you see with your eyes. But this is re-
futed by what you say that the Scripture is proued by
Tradition, which is as certaine and infallible, as Scrip-
ture and euidently true and credible of it selfe: *Ergo*
your beliefe of Scripture, that it is the word of God, is
also resolued into this one reason, vnto which all others
must submit, and yield themselves humbly subiect, *God*
sayth that these bookes are his word, and infallible truth; Er-
go it is so, these bookes are his word, & infallible truth;

so that Christian resolution of fayth euen by your own confession, resteth finally vpon a reason vnto which all human reason and vnderstanding ought to submit, and captiuate it selfe. You see how by your contradicting your self, your errors are ouerthrown, and true Christianity established.

The ninth Conuiction.

Lond.
Edition

Pag. 34.
lin. 14.

23. P Ag. 357. lin. 3. cap. 6. n. 28. thus you write:

I certainly know, that I do believe the Ghospel of Christ, as it is deliuered in the vndoubted bookes of canonicall Scripture, as verily as that it is now day, that I see the light, that I am now writing; and I believe it vpon this motiue, because I conceaue it sufficiently, abundantly, superabundantly proued to be diuine Revelation. And yet in this I do not depend vpon any succession of men, that haue alwayes believed it, without any mixture of Error. Nay, I am fully persuaded, that there hath been no such succession, and yet do not find ANY WEAKENESSE in my fayth, but am so fully assured of the truth of it, that though an Angel from heauen should gayn-say it, or any part of it, I persuaide my selfe I should not be moued. Thus you: many wayes establishing the absolute certainty of Christian fayth, and in direct termes contradicting what elsewhere you most earnestly affirme.

(m) Pag.
325. n. 3.

24. First, you ouerthrow what you elsewhere (m) say, that the certainty of fayth is not equal to that of sense, for now you say, that you certainly know, and that you are fully assured that you believe the truth of the Ghospell, as verily as that now it is day, as that you see the light, as that when you writ this you were writing, which is most assured certainty of sense. For you say, you are fully assured, that without depending on succession, you believe

believe (not that which you thinke to be the truth of the Gospell (for euery Heretique doth so) but the true Gospell: consequently you are as sure, that what you believe is the true Gospell, as you are sure that it is light which you see at noon-day; as you are sure you write when you write. And so you professe that the certainty of your fayth is equal to the greatest certainty which can be had by sense. If you say you speake this, not of ordinary Christian fayth, which is rational, & grounded on reasons, but of special fayth which you haue from God infused into your vnderstanding in reward of your holy life; I answer this cannot be so, because you speake expressly of your fayth which standes vpon the proofes of Christianity, and the *motiues* of credibility, and of that assent which you conceaue, *because proued vnto you abundantly by the said reasons*, which is ordinary Christian fayth, and so you say in this place, *that any man may believe the foresayd truths vpon the foresayd motiues.*

24. Secondly, here you affirme that Christian Religion or the Ghospel is proued to be diuine Reuelation sufficiently, abundantly, superabundantly to beare the weight of a most certayn and fully assured fayth, wherein there is not **ANY WEAKENESSE**. By which you ouerthrow what you say elsewhere, (n) that Christian(n) *fayth stands vpon two legs, vpon two pillars, the one that* 36. *whatsoeuer God reueales is true*, which is most strong, firme, immoueable; the second, that *the Ghospel is reuealed of God*; which pillar, you say, is *weake, infirme, and inhabile*, (o) *morally certayne, but not able to beare the weight* (o) *of an absolute certaine & infallible assent, free from all weak-* 112. n. *esse.* 154.

25. Thirdly, you say that fayth built vpon the forsaide motiues,

motiues, is so firme, and so strong, so assured as you should not (as you thinke) be moued, though an Angel from heauen should gain-say it, which doth manifestly contradict and destroy what you so often contend, that the assent built vpon the motiues of credibility, cannot be absolutely certaine, no not though it were infused into the vnderstanding from God. What you say of your self, you should not be moued from the fayth of the Ghospel, though an Angel from heauen should gain-say it, how stubborne and pertinacious in error you may be against the light of your conscience I do not know: but if your fayth of the Ghospell be not *certaine and infallible*, if it be but a very probable, seeming, or a moral certainty, in this case that you could stand against an Angel from heauen prudently, and according to the right *dictamen* of conscience, this I will belieue, if you can make me belieue, that a *Shilling-worth* is as much as an *Angell-worth*: Otherwise what greater folly then for a meere mortall man of so weake memory and miserable discourse, as he cannot write three pages together in good sense without contradicting himself, to preferre his priuate seeming, his human fallible certainty, his moral probabilities, that this is Gods word, before the word of an Angell, and all the arguments he can bring against it?

26. I conclude with this demonstration for the infallibility of our Christian fayth. God commandeth all Christians, and requires of them vnder payne of damnation to stand constant in the beliefe of the Ghospell, euen *against an Angell from heauen that should Euangelize to the contrary*, as you suppose truly, this being the *Gal. 1. 8.* very doctrine of *S. Paul*. But except God did infuse into the heart of euery true believing Christian a most certaine,

taine, vndoubted, infallible assent, and adherence to the Ghospel; this command were vniust, vnreasonable, and such a precept as no man prudently might obserue. For it cannot be wisdom to oppose the testimony of men, and seeming probabilities of reason against the word of an Angel, against Angelicall reasons and discourse. *Ergo*, God doth infuse and bindeth all Christians to admit a most certaine, and infallible assent of the truth of the Ghospel, and of Christian Religion.



K

That



*That Christian Religion and Tradition is pure and
incorrupt, both in the fountayne
and streame.*

CHAP. III.



WHAT may haue been your personal intention in penning and publishing of this worke, the searcher of hearts knoweth best. The end wherunto your course driueth, the marke wher-at it aymeth, the worke it laboureth with all might and mayne to bring to passe is the total ouerthrowe of Christianity. In the first Chapter I haue shewed, that you resolute Christian Religion into naturall reason, wherby you destroy the Diuinity therof. In the secoud, that you make the same to stand vpon principles and motiues credible but fallible, wherby you vndermine the absolute certainty therof. In this third Chapter I am to shew, you overthrow the truth therof, and make the same stayned with ignorance and errour, not only in the whole current of Tradition from the Apostles; but also in the fountayne therof the holy Ghospel, and in our Sauour and Lord Christ Iesus the Authour.

The

The first Conviction.

1. **Y**OU thrust a mortall stabbe into the heart of Christian Religion through S. Augustine his side, whiles you charge his speech with palpable falshood which is the expresse word of Christ. S. Austine say you ca 6.n. 14. in fine) as he was in the right in thinking, that the Church was extended further then Africk, so was he in the wrong, if he thought that of necessity it alwayes must be so: but most Palpably Mistaken in conceauing, that it was then spread ouer the whole earth, and knowne to all nations; Which, if passion did not trouble you, and make you forget, how lately almost halfe of the world was discovered, and in what state it was then found, you would very easily see, and confesse. Thus you. Vnto whome I say what the same S. Augustine sayd to Maximinus an Arian, that is almost the same though not altogether so bad as a Socinian: *O quam de Aduersario proximo te corrigeres, si timeres credere quod times dicere!* Maximinus. Ohow soone would you reclayme your selfe, did you feare to belieue in heart, what you feare to say in words. For although you dare not openly professe with the Samosatians, yet you dare belieue that Christ Iesus is a meere man, that he was ignorant, that there were any such people as Americans in the world, and so out of ignorance vttered a palpable falshood, when he said, that his Apostles should preach pennance in his name vnto all Nations: that they should be witnesses vnto him, not only in Ierusalem, Iewry, & Samaria, but also vnto thee vt most of the world. Hereby he induced the Euangelists to mistake, and falsely say, that the Apostles going preached Euery Where, Lord working with them, and confirming the word by signes that followed. And S. Paul; that the Apostolicall Preaching was spread into all Lands, and their words vnto the endes of is.

the world. If I say, *S. Augustins* saying, that the Church was spread ouer all Nations in his dayes, be a palpable falshood, because it was not then in *America*; then the prophesyes of our Lord, that his Apostles should spread his name, and plant Christianity in all Nations, as also the testimony of the Ghospell, that this was performed by the Apostles, were also manifest mistakes; and if the Ghospell be mistaken in one poynt through ignorance in the Author thereof, we can be certayne of nothing.

2. For if one confesse, that our Sauour was true God and knew all things, and that there were *Americans* at that tyme, he must say, that eyther our Lord willingly spake an vntruth, in saying the Apostles should preach to all nations, & so by admitting on lye to be in one saying of the Ghospell, he destroyeth the certainty of all; or he must say that the Apostles preached to the *Americans*, and made them Christians (and if they were Christians in the dayes of the Apostles, how can you tell they were not also in the dayes of *S. Austine*?) or finally he must confesse the truth, that this speech of the Ghospell, that the Church was euery where, and in all nations, was a most certayne, and infallible truth, euen when the *Americans* were not Christians, nor had heard of Christ. But this you deny and call it a palpable falshood so cleere, as euery man not blinded with passiō doth now perceauē the falshood thereof. *Ergo* you deny the Ghospell, which you grant to be the word of God, and consequently you are a *formall Hereticke*, c. 2. n. 122. you do a thing not only impious but also impossible, that any Christian should do, as you say cap 4. n. 4. lin. 19. a supposition impossible. cap. 3. n. 35. lin. 21. you do a thing you professe against, saying you would not be moued from the truth of the Ghospell or any part of it, euen by the preaching

preaching of an Angell from heauen. So that your last refuge must be to confesse, that to call S. Austins speech, which is the expresse word of Christ, a palpable falsehood, you were perswaded not by an Angell from Heauen, but by the spirit of error, which makes you hate subiection to the one vniuersall visible Church.

The second Conuiction.

3. **Y**OW do not vndermine, but openly digge vp the Foundations of Christianity by teaching, that the Apostles through ignorance, ouersight, or partiality erred in matters of Religion which they were bound to know; Erred I say, and the whole Church with them, euen after the coming of the holy Ghost, for thus you write c. 3. n. 31. *That the Apostles themselves euen after the sending of the holy Ghost, were, & through inaduertence, or preiudice, continued for a tyme in an error, it is (as I haue already noted) vnanswerably euident from the story of the Actes of the Apostles.* Thus you, & you auouch the same cap. 3. n. 21. But in direct contradiction of this, you say cap. 3. n. 74. lin. 14. about the perpetuall infallibility of the Apostles, according to that promise of our Lord, that he would send them the holy Ghost, the spirit of truth, which should teach them all truth, and stay with them for euer. It signifies, say you, not eternally without end of tyme, but PERPETVALLY without interruption during the time of their liues: So that the force and sence of the words is, that they should neuer want the Spirits assistance in the performance of their function. If the holy Ghost leading them into all truth, did after his coming perpetually without interruption during the time of their liues stay with them alwayes assisting them, & teaching them all truth; how can it be true, that euen

after the sending of the holy Ghost they were lead into error, and continued therein for as TIME, through *inadvertence* or *preiudice*? An error so playne and manifest against the word of God, and which they could not fall into without they were stupide, seing the very guift of speaking the tongues of all nations, which they receaued togeather with the holy Ghost, still continued with them. Were they so dull and heavy-hearted euen after they had receaued the holy Ghost, as not to understand, that by the guift of Tongues they were declared, and made preachers of Christ vnto all nations vnder the cope of heauen?

4. What you say that they erred and continued in error through *inadvertence*, and *preiudice*, you contradict elsewhere; saying cap. 2. n. 155. *that the Apostles in their persons while they were liuing were the only iudges of Controuersies.* And, c. 2. n. 17 you say, *In matters of Religion none are fit to be iudges, but such as are infallible.* And cap. 4. n. 88. lin. 20. *It is necessary for the constitution of infallible iudges, that though they neglect the meanes of auoiding error, yet certainly they shall not erre.* Now can you put these propositions togeather in discourse? The Apostles were, while they were liuing, the infallible guides & iudges of fayth, so made and ordained by the comming downe of the holy Ghost vpon them: Iudges and guides infallible certainly shall not erre, though they through *inadvertence* or *preiudice* neglect the meanes of auoyding error: Ergo the Apostles certainly did not erre, nor deliuer error through *negligence*, *inadvertence* or *preiudice*. And yet more to the same effect you write C. 2. n. 34 *The Apostles infallibility was in a more absolute manner, the Churches in a more limited sense. The Apostles were lead by the Spirit into all truth efficaciter: The Church is lead also*
into

into all truth sufficient. So that the Apostles and the Church may be fitly compared to the Starre, and the Wisemen. The Starre was directed by the finger of God, and could not but goe right to the place where Christ was. But the Wisemen were lead by the starre to Christ, lead, I say, not efficaciter or irresistibiliter, but sufficienter; so that, if they would, they might follow it, if they would not, they might choose.

5. But you stay not long in this conceyte of their absolute infallibility, and being irresistably lead, into all truth; for within two or three pages you say, that the promise of not erring was made them, but upon condition if they were not negligent, and if they kept their station. And. cap. 3. n. 77. Our Saviour sayd to his disciples, Ye are the salt of the earth, not that this quality was inseparable from their Persons, but because it was their office to be so. For if they must haue beene so of necessity, & could not haue beene otherwise, in vaine had he put them in feare of that which followes; If the salt lose the sauour, wherewith shall it be salted? Behold how you fault: before they were lead into all truth of necessity, efficaciter, irresistibiliter; now not infallibly, not of necessity, they were in possibility to erre. Neyther yet do you take vp your standing heere; (a) you runne into the contrary extreme, that the Apostles, could not lose the sauour of sanctity, or charity and truth, because it is certayne they could not haue any worldly or sinister intent in their preaching. And then agayne to the contrary, cap. 2. n. 93. This were to crosse the end of our creation, which was to be glorified by free obedience. To conclude (for I am weary with the following of your light-headed guide fetching frisks euery way) you iumpe at last vpon a truth, the direct contradiction of that you sayd of the Apostles erring for a tyme about the Churches Vniuersality. For you say cap. 6. n. 14. The Apostles who preached the

the Gospell in the beginning, did believe the Church vniuersal, though their preaching in the beginning was not so. They did believe the Church vniuersall, even in your sense, that is, vniuersall *de iure*, though not *de facto*. Thus you. Now this proposition; The Apostles euen in the beginning, before their preaching was vniuersall, when they preached to Iewes only, did beleeue the Church vniuersall *de iure*, by diuine law; is it not a direct contradiction of this; The Apostles in the beginning before their preaching was vniuersall, did not believe the Church vniuersall *de iure*, by diuine law; yea they erred thinking it was against the diuine law to preach vniuersally, or to any but Iewes? It is well that your wit, the guide of your fayth, doth professe that it can believe contradictions at once, *this Heresy, and this Truth*, otherwise it could not be the guide of that Religion you maintayne in your booke.

The third Conuiction.

6. **F**ROM the Apostles you passe to the second age after Christ, accusing the vniuersal Tradition of that Primitiue Church as stayned vniuersally with impure and corrupt doctrine. *Cap. 5. n. 91. lin. 41.* seeking to answere what *Charity Maintayn'd* objects, that sundry Protestants acknowledge many of our doctrines to be taught by the ancient Fathers, you say, No antiquity, except it be absolute and primitiue, is a certaine signe of true doctrine. For if the Church were obnoxious to corruption (as we pretend it was) who can possibly warrant vs, that part of this corruption might not get in, and preuaile in the 5. or 4. or 3. or 2. age? Especially seing the Apostles assure vs that the mystery of iniquity was working, though secretly, euen in their times. If any man aske, how could it become

come vniuersal in so short a time? let him tell me how the error of the Millenaries, and the Communicating of Infants, became so soone vniuersal, and then he shall acknowledge what was done in some, was possible in others. Thus you. Which you repeate, and inculcate, more then forty times at the least; wherein you are like to the false witnesses, to one of the which Daniel said very well: *Thou hast spoken falsely against thy owne head, for the Angell of God shall deuide thee with a sword in the middes, and doe thee away.* You are false against the spouse of Christ, the holy primitiue Church, as that witnessse was against *Susanna*; and the same punishment of diuision, and contradiction against your selfe is by God's iust sentence fallen on your head.

7. You are false in saying, so many times, that the doctrine of the *Millenaries* (to wit of Christs earthly Kingdome in the earthly *Ierusalem*, full of all earthly felicity for a thousand yeares) was deliuered, as you say, pag. 347. lin. 24. as an *Apostolicall Tradition*; that it was vniuersally receaued, taught by all the Doctours, and Saints, and Martyrs, of, or about that time, whose iudgement in this point is any way recorded. This to be false is proued by your falsification of *S. Iustine Martyr*, whome you make say, that all good and orthodoxe Christians in his time belieued it, and only hereticks denied it: for his words are, *I, and the Christians who are rightly perswaded in all things, belieue the Resurrection of the bodies, & a thousands yeares in pure the new Ierusalem.* It is true, all good Christians belieue the Resurrection of the body (which you skippe ouer, because Socinians do not belieue it in the Christian sense) and a thousand yeares of felicity in the new *Ierusalem*, in heauen not vpon earth. Yea *S. Iustine* in that place doth plainly confesse that, *Many* who are of the

(p) *Iustine*
Dialog.
cum Try-
phone.

(q) *Mul-*
tos qui
pieq; sunt
Christi-
anorum
sentētie.
hoc non
agnoscere
tibi signi-
fican.
the

(r) Tom.
3. in 3. p.
Disput.

212. c. 2.

n. 13.

(s) Serm.
de lapsis.

(t) Par-
uulis

saltem

sub spe-

cie vini

tradatur.

(u) Con-
cil. Trid.

sess. 21 c.

4.

(w) Nisi

mandu-

cauerint

carnem

eius non

habebūt

vitam,

significat

Baptiza-

tos vi-

tam ha-

bere

non pos-

se præ-

ter Chri-

sti cor-

pus cui

ut incor-

porantur

Sacra-

mento

baptis-

matis

imbu-

untur.

the pure, and pious Christian fayth, did hold against this con-
cept of Christs earthly Kingdome.

8. More false you are about the Communicating of
Infants for you are not able to name so much as one
Father of the second age which holds it. The words of
Dionysius Arcopagita, the only witness produced in
this cause, being short of this sense, as Vasquez (r)
sheweth: S. Cyprian (s) is the first that mentioned this
custome to communicate sucking Infants vnder one
kind, to wit, giuing them to (t) drinke of the Chalice,
which custome was good & lawfull, as all Catholiks
defend (u). It is cleere that Pope Innocentius with
(w) S. Austine and other Fathers disputing against Pe-
lagius, who denied Originall sinne, and taught that
Children were saued dying without Baptisme, did by
the eating of the body of Christ, and drinking his blood ne-
cessary for Infants, vnderstand no more then incorpora-
tion into the mysticall body of Christ, which was done by
Baptisme. And this was in Infants to eate the body of
Christ, and drinke his blood, [not with their owne (x)
mouth, but by the mouth of the body wherof they are
members, to wit of the Church.

9. I haue cleared the Catholick primitive Church,
& shewed her innocent of your slanders, now I come
to the second, that *mentitus es in caput tuum*, your owne
false accusations light vpon your owne head, that by
your depositions you are proued more impudent then im-
pudencie it selfe. For c. 2. n. 163. in fine you say, That it is
euident, and to impudence it selfe vnderstandable, that vpon this
ground of believing all things taught by the present Church, as
taught by Christ, Error was held. For example, the necessity
of the Eucharist for Infants, and that by S. Austen himselfe,
and therefore certayne this is no certayne ground of truth.

Thus

Thus you. Now what you here prononce vnderiable
 by impudence it selfe, your selfe deny contending that S. rit. & res
Austin held the necessity of the Eucharist for Infants vpon
 the warrant of the Tradition of all ages since the Apo-
 stles, which is a prooffe distinct from the doctrine and
 practice of the present vniuersall Church, as you say,
cap. 2. n. 53. lin. ult. The credit of Tradition is not the Tra-
dition of the present Church, which we pretend may deuiate
from the ancient. Now that S. Austin did ground vpon
 the credit of Tradition Apostolicall, or of all ages, you
 say, *cap. 3. n. 47. in fine. The practice of communicating In-*
fant had euen then, in the tyme of S. Augustine, got the
credit and authority, not only of Vniuersall custome, but also of
an Apostolique Tradition. Behold the necessity of Commu-
 nicating Infants is held by S. Augustine vpon the warrant
 not of the present Church, but of the Church of all
 ages and places, which you, euen in that very place al-
 low to be a good warrant. Yea you affirme that S. Au-
 gustine in thinking the necessity of giuing the Eucha-
 rist to Infants to be a Tradition of all ages since the A-
 postles to his tyme was not deceiued, laying *pag. 152.*
lin. 32. The doctrines of the Millenaries, and the Eucharist
necessity for Infants haue beene taught by the consent of
the eminent Fathers of some ages (you meane the 2. 3. 4. 5.)
 Without any (y) opposition from any of their contemporaries,
 and were deliuered by them, not as Doctours, but as Witnesses,
 not as their owne (z) Opinions, but as Apostolick Traditions.
 Thus you. Who now is more impudēt, then impudence
 it selfe? Do not you deny S. Austins persuation of the
 necessity of the Eucharist for Infants to haue beene
 grounded on the bare vniuersall custome of the present
 Church? And yet it is also false, that S. Austine groun-
 ded the necessity of the Eucharist for Infants on the cu-

de peccat. eat. me- rit. & res miss. lib. 5. c. 4. vide form. c. in s. dem citatum Beda in cap. 10. ad Cor. 1. Claud. Sanchez Rep. 6. c. 7. (x) Quā- uis suo corde & ore id non agant. August. de peccat. merit & remiss. lib. 1. c. 20. (y) A manifest falshood They were contra- dicted by Dion. Areop. de Ec- cles. Hie- rar. c. 7. By Clem. Alex. 3^e Strom. in the second

age By
Cains, S.
Cyprian,
Dionys.
Alexan.
Euseb.
in the 3.
(2) Ano-
ther im-
pudent
For they
deliue-
red their
Mille-
ry do-
ctrine as
an expo-
sition of
Mille
Anni of
the Apo-
calyps c.
20. v. 3.
(a) Ioan.
6. 36.
(b) De
peccat.
merit &
remiss.
lib. i. c.
20. Nisi
pertina-
cia pug-
naces
ueros
aduersus
constan-
tiam per-
spicue
ueritatis

some of the present Church, or on the Tradition of all ages. For though there were an vniuersall perpetuall custome of communicating Infants; yet that doth not enforce that it was a thing necessary, but only lawfull and godly, because all vniuersall customes vsed in the primitiue Church, were not necessary, but pious; S. *Austine* then his perswasion, that the eating of the body of Christ was necessary for Infants, he did build on the Scripture only, & the euidence thereof vpon this text, (a) *Except you eat the flesh, and drinke the blood of the Sonne of man, you shall not haue life in your*, which testimony he termeth (b) *diuinâ luce clarissimum, diuinâ auctoritate certissimum* so cleere as it cannot be resisted but by pertinacity it selfe.

10. You contradict your selfe so farre as to proue your selfe to be a formall Heretike against God and his Word: For you say, (c) *it is most impious for one to deny that to be true, which he knowes, or belicues to be Gods word*; In so much that if one be perswaded, though fallely, euen by the Diuell himselfe, that it is the word of God, if he disbeliue it, you say, he is (d) a formall Heretike. But you professe your selfe not only perswaded, but conuincd, not by the Diuels discourse, but by the (e) *euident credibility of the thing*, that vniuersall Tradition since the Apostles is the word of God vnwritten, as certaine and infallible as Scripture, (f) *the rule of fayth to iudge all controuersies by*. And yet you say, that this Tradition, this word of God vnwritten, is fallible, yea false, and erroneous in some particulars. Could you haue professed greater impiety, or more formall emnity agaynst God and his word?

11. Thirdly, by your contradictions and diuisions agaynst your selfe, you deuide your selfe from Christ and

& saluatiō. c. ap. 6. n. 1. you say, that it is most absolutely, & intendat. indispensably destructive of saluation to deny Iesus to be the (c) cap. Christ, or the Scripture to be the word of God. But you are 2. n. 13. conuincd by your owne words, to doe this, by char- cap. 4. n. 11. ging with fallibility and falshood euen the Tradition of (d) cap. 2. the primitiue Church of the very first age since the A- n. 122. postles. For you confesse that the Scripture cannot be (c) cap. proued to be the word of God, by the diuinity & light 2. n. 25. of the matter, nor by any Apostolicall writing, but (f) cap. 3. n. 45. by tradition, c. 2. n. 8. lin. 9. and cap. 2. n. 27. lin. 33. ONLY by the testimony of the ancient Church. Now if the only meanes to know that the Scripture is the word of God, be the testimony of the anccient Church, and of the primi- tiue Christians, if you make (as you do) their testimony to be fallible, obnoxious to errour, and in many things false, you make all assurance of this necessary poynt, that the Scripture is the word of God, impossible: You contend our Catholicke Roman Church to be fallible, and to haue erred in many things, and thence conclude, you can rely on her authority in nothing. I might, say you, cap. 2. n. 25. lin. 9. as well rest vpon the iudgement of the next man I meet, or vpon the chaunce of a Lottery for it. For by this meanes I only know I might erre, but relying on your Church, I know I should erre. Thus you of the Roman church, which agrees to Tradition vniuersal of the pri- mitiue Christians: for if it be, as you say it is, fallible, we cannot be possibly warranted that it doth not giue quid for quo, a scorpion for an egge, an errour in steed of A- postolicall doctrine: for she hath done so, you say, in some other vniuersall Traditions, and what was done in some, was possible in others. The primitiue Church (as you contend) did by vniuersall Tradition, and full consent deliuer the doctrine of the Millenaries, and of the Communion

of Infants for Apostolicall, which you say be errours, and so it may be that the same consent of primitive Christians hath deliuered vnto vs the Ghospell of S. Luke, and of S. Marke, as approued by (g) all the Apostles, though there were neuer any such thing; nor haue we any possible meanes to know whether heerein we be deceaued or no. You say cap. 2. n. 93. lin. 11. *It was necessary that by his prouidence he should preserue the Scripture from any vndiscernable corruption in those things he would haue knowne, otherwise they could not haue beene knowne, the onely meanes of continuing the knowledge of them being perished.* Now the onely meanes to know which Scriptures be the word of God, and rule of fayth is (as you confesse) the testimony of the ancient Churches since the Apostles, and yet you say, God hath not preserued the same from vndiscernable corruption; for the Church hath beene corrupt in some of her vniuersal Traditions from the Apostles: so that there is no meanes to be sure that her Tradition about Scripture is incorrupt: For you say, *what was done in some, was possible in others*, and so we haue no warrant that the canon of Scripture is not corrupt vniuersall Tradition of the Church since the Apostles. You see that I sayd true, that by being a false witness against the incorrupt purity of the Primitive Church, you haue beene false agaynst your owne Salvation, and haue lost all meanes to be assured of Sauing fayth.

(g) Cap. 2. n. 7.
Wrote indeed by
some but
approued
by all.

The fourth Conuiction.

12. FROM the second age you proceed, affirming that still the mystery of iniquity wrought more openly in the ensuing ages, and that in the dayes of S. Austin, (h) the Catholike Church it selfe did (h) Pag. tolerate, and dissemble wayne superstitions, and human pre- 155. lin. sumptions, suffer all places to be full of them, suffer them to be 20. cap. 3. more seuerely exacted then the Commandements of God, (i) n. 47. doing therein directly against the command of the holy Ghost; Second Edition (k) permitting the diuine precepts euery where to be layd a- pag. 149. side; so that these superstitious Christians euery where might & 150. be said to worship God in vaine, as well as Scribes & Pharisees. (i) Pag. Great variety of superstitions in this Kind were then already 156. lin. 1. (k) Ibid. spread quer the Church, being different in diuers places. Thas lin. 11. (m) this vniuersal superstition in the Church, nourished, che- (l) Ibid. rished, strengthened by the practise of the most, and urged with lin. 19. great violence vpon others as the Commandements of God (m) Pag. might in tyme take deep roote, and passe for vniuersall custome 156. li. 36. of the Church, and an Apostolique Tradition, he that doth not see, sees nothing. Finally, that in S. Austins dayes the Church did not tolerate only such superstitions, (for but a part only, and farre the lesser did tolerate them in silence) but the Church or the farre greater part publicquely allowed them, practised them, and urged them vpon others with great violence &c.

13. Thus you write, and make the face of the Church in S. Austines dayes to haue been most miserable, full of superstition, in which not so much as one could be saued, but by repentance, and leauing their superstitions, which they neuer did. But, as it is your fury against Gods Church to vtter whatsoeuer comes into your mind to her disgrace, without any care of truth, so your folly is to forget presently what you haue said and
 speake

speake the contrary. For Cap. 6. n. 101. lin. 12. you say, that in *S. Austin's* tyme the publike service, wherein men are to communicate was impolluted, and no unlawfull thing practised in their Communion; which was so true as euen the Donatists did not deny it. And c. 6. in fine, you say, The Church which then was a Virgin, now may be an harlot. Now, if a man would haue studied to contradict your slander against the Church of *S. Augustins* tyme, could he haue done it more directly? The Church being then, as you say it was, in her communion and diuine service, an impolluted virgin, how can it stand with what you said before, that Christians in all places were urged with great violence to communicate in superstitions, and vaine worshipps, and to lay the commandments of God aside? Againe, you cleere the Church of that age cap. 6. n. 101. versus finem. The Donatists (in *S. Augustines* tyme) were separated from the whole world of Christians united in one communion, professing the same fayth, seruing God after the same manner, which was a great argument, they could not haue cause to leaue them; according to that of Tertullian, that where there is erring, there is variety of errings. And, is not this a variety, yea a direct contradiction in your writing, an vnanswerable argument that you erre and wander from the truth? Now, you say, there was then euery where the same fayth, the same communion, one manner of seruing and worshipping God, without any variety of superstitions, and errors; whereas before you said, that in *S. Austins* dayes, all places were full of vaine superstitions, vaine worshipps, with great variety of them, spread ouer the Church being different in diuers places, urged with great senerity, and violence. How different are you from your selfe in diuers places? To bring in your new Religion of the Bible, and only the Bible, you accuse the Ancient Fathers, that they are
with

with full consent, opposit one to auother, ages against ages; but in your *so wisely chosen Religion*, there is such a perpetual fighting that there is more difference betwixt two of your pages, then betwixt all Christian ages.

14. I must note in this place (to answere a seely calumination against our Church, the only argument in your Booke that may trouble an ignorant Reader, because it requires some litle historical erudition to confute it) that though you feigne the Church in the dayes of *S. Augustine* full of great variety of superstitions; yet you say, that the *Donatists* did falsely caluminate Catholikes, that they did set Images vpon their Altars, and (n) *S. Austine* doth not iustify the Church, saying, as he would haue done in that case, *Those pictures were worshipped not for their owne sake, but for them who were represented by them, but doth abhorre the thing, and deny the imputation.* Behold here a tale of a Tub, or of *I know not what.* For, cap. 6. n. 16. you acknowledge that *S. Augustine* makes no mention of any picture, but by a Rhetoricall figure calles it (*I know not what:*) but (say you) compare him with Optatus, and you shall plainly perceauce, that this, *I know not what*, pretended to be set vpon the Altar, was indeed a picture. Behold in this your second telling the tale of a Tub, or of (*I know not what*) you are fallen from pictures to a picture, granting that the *Donatists* did not accuse Catholicks for setting vp all kind of pictures in the Church, or vpon the Altar, but for a picture. I will not stand to note and shew the ridiculous vanity of the inference you tacitly make; It was a picture; Ergo the picture of Christ, or of some Saint: but tell the Reader, what that picture was, and of whome, to wit of *Constans* the Emperour, Sonne to *Constantine* the Great. This most

speake the contrary. For Cap. 6. n. 101. lin. 12. you say, that in *S. Austin's* tyme the publike service, wherein men are to communicate was impolluted, and no unlawfull thing practised in their Communion; which was so true as euen the Donatists did not deny it. And c. 6. in fine, you say, The Church which then was a Virgin, now may be an harlot. Now, if a man would haue studied to contradict your slander against the Church of *S. Augustins* tyme, could he haue done it more directly? The Church being then, as you say it was, in her communion and diuine service, an impolluted virgin, how can it stand with what you said before, that Christians in all places were urged with great violence to communicate in superstitions, and vaine worships, and to lay the commandments of God aside? Again, you cleere the Church of that age cap. 6. n. 101. versus finem. The Donatists (in *S. Augustines* tyme) were separated from the whole world of Christians united in one communion, professing the same fayth, seruing God after the same manner, which was a great argument, they could not haue cause to leaue them; according to that of Tertullian, that where there is erring, there is variety of errings. And, is not this a variety, yea a direct contradiction in your writing, an vnanswerable argument that you erre and wander from the truth? Now, you say, there was then euery where the same fayth, the same communion, one manner of seruing and worshipping God, without any variety of superstitions, and errors; whereas before you said, that in *S. Austins* dayes, all places were full of vaine superstitions, vaine worships, with great variety of them, spread ouer the Church being different in diuers places, urged with great senerity, and violence. How different are you from your selfe in diuers places? To bring in your new Religion of the Bible, and only the Bible, you accuse the Ancient Fathers, that they are
with

with full consent, opposit one to auother, ages against ages; but in your *so wisely chosen Religion*, there is such a perpetual fighting that there is more difference betwixt two of your pages, then betwixt all Christian ages.

14. I must note in this place (to answere a seely calumination against our Church, the only argument in your Booke that may trouble an ignorant Reader, because it requires some litle historical erudition to confute it) that though you feigne the Church in the dayes of *S. Augustine* full of great variety of superstitions, yet you say, that the *Donatists* did falsely caluminate Catholikes, that they did set Images vpon their Altars, and (n) *S. Austine* doth not iustify the Church, saying, as he would haue done in that case, Those pictures were worshipped not for their owne sake, but for them who were represented by them, but doth abhorre the thing, and deny the imputation. Behold here a tale of a Tub, or of I know not what. For, cap. 6. n. 16. you acknowledge that *S. Augustine* makes no mention of any picture, but by a Rhetoricall figure calles it (I know not what:) but (say you) compare him with Optatus, and you shall plainly perceauce, that this, I know not what, pretended to be set vpon the Altar, was indeed a picture. Behold in this your second telling the tale of a Tub, or of (I know not what), you are fallen from pictures to a picture, granting that the *Donatists* did not accuse Catholicks for setting vp all kind of pictures in the Church, or vpon the Altar, but for a picture. I will not stand to note and shew the ridiculous vanity of the inference you tacitly make; It was a picture; Ergo the picture of Christ, or of some Saint: but tell the Reader, what that picture was, and of whome, to wit of *Constans* the Emperour, Sonne to *Constantine* the Great. This most

speake the contrary. For Cap. 6. n. 101. lin. 12. you say, that in *S. Austin's* tyme the publike service, wherein men are to communicate was impolluted, and no unlawfull thing practised in their Communion; which was so true as euen the Donatists did not deny it. And c. 6. in fine, you say, *The Church which then was a Virgin, now may be an harlot*. Now, if a man would haue studied to contradict your slander against the Church of *S. Augustins* tyme, could he haue done it more directly? *The Church being then, as you say it was, in her communion and diuine service, an impolluted virgin, how can it stand with what you said before, that Christians in all places were urged with great violence to communicate in superstitions, and vaine worships, and to lay the commandments of God aside? Again, you cleere the Church of that age cap. 6. n. 101. versus finem. The Donatists (in S. Augustines tyme) were separated from the whole world of Christians united in one communion, professing the same fayth, seruing God after the same manner; which was a great argument, they could not haue cause to leaue them; according to that of Tertullian, that where there is erring, there is variety of errings. And, is not this a variety, yea a direct contradiction in your writing, an vnanswerable argument that you erre and wander from the truth? Now, you say, there was then euery where the same fayth, the same communion, one manner of seruing and worshipping God, without any variety of superstitions, and errors; whereas before you said, that in *S. Austins* dayes, all places were full of vaine superstitions, vaine worships, with great variety of them, spread ouer the Church being different in diuers places, urged with great senerity, and violence. How different are you from your selfe in diuers places? To bring in your new Religion of the Bible, and only the Bible, you accuse the Ancient Fathers, that they are*

with

with full consent, opposit one to auother, ages against ages; but in your *so wisely chosen Religion*, there is such a perpetual fighting that there is more difference betwixt two of your pages, then betwixt all Christian ages.

14. I must note in this place (to answere a feely calumniation against our Church, the only argument in your Booke that may trouble an ignorant Reader, because it requires some litle historical erudition to confute it) that though you feigne the Church in the dayes of *S. Augustine* full of great variety of superstitions, yet you say, that the *Donatists* did falsely calumniate Catholikes, that they did set Images vpon their Altars, and (n) *S. Austine* doth not iustify the Church, saying, as he would haue done in that case, *Those pictures were worshipped not for their owne sake, but for them who were represented by them, but doth abhorre the thing, and deny the imputation.* Behold here a tale of a Tub, or of *I know not what.* For, cap. 6. n. 16. you acknowledge that *S. Augustine* makes no mention of any picture, but by a Rhetoricall figure calles it (*I know not what:*) but (say you) compare him with Optatus, and you shall plainly perceauce, that this, *I know not what*, pretended to be set vpon the Altar, was indeed a picture. Behold in this your second telling the tale of a Tub, or of (*I know not what*) you are fallen from pictures to a picture, granting that the *Donatists* did not accuse Catholicks for setting vp all kind of pictures in the Church, or vpon the Altar, but for a picture. I will not stand to note and shew the ridiculous vanity of the inference you tacitly make; It was a picture; Ergo the picture of Christ, or of some Saint: but tell the Reader, what that picture was, and of whome, to wit of *Constans* the Emperour, Sonne to *Constantine* the Great. This most

(o) Cum eleemo-
synis, quibus
subleua-
ta per
Ecclesi-
as sin-
gulas, possit
respira-
re, vesti-
ti, pasci
gaudere
pauper-
tas.
(p) Aug. contr. li-
ter. 1.2.
c. 39. Fal-
sa opi-
nio om-
nium
populo-
rum au-
res op-
pleuerat
Diceba-
tur enim
ventu-
ros Pau-
lum &
Macari-
um, qui
interf-
sent sa-

pious Christian Emperour (as *Optatus* relates) sent two chief noble men of his Court *Paulus* and *Macarius* eminent for Christian piety and wisdom in Ambassadage into *Africke*, with (o) great liberalities to bestow on poore Christians, *Donatists* especially, hoping by this courtesy, to win their hearts vnto vnity with the Church. The Bishops of the *Donatists* fearing the suc-
cesse of this Imperial liberality, did mightily maligne the two Noblemen, especially *Macarius*, whome they somtimes assaulted in his iourneys, put him in danger of his life, sought to take from him by force that Impe-
rial treasure: & because in one assault they made, some two *Donatists* were slayne, they presently proclaymed them Martyrs, (p) *Macarius* a Persecutour, a Pagan, and called Catholiques *Macarians* of him. Amongst other tales and slanders they gaue out, that (q) *Paulus* and *Macarius* when they were present at the Christian sa-
crifice, vled to set vp the image of the Emperour, on the Altar, and that before it sacrifice was offered, and the oblations of the people made: wherof the Reader may be more fully informed in *Baronius Anno 348*. Behold the best argument & erudition of your Booke, what a poore Inake it is being brought to light out of the lurking hole of your darke and dimidiate narration of the fact.

The fifth Conuiction.

15. Y Ou often affirme that the whole Church cā-
not vtterly perish, nor loose its Essence and
Being. cap. 3. n. 78. You know we grant, & must grant that the
Church still holdes all necessary truths; for it is of the essence of
the Church to doe so. But pag. 347. l. 21. You say the cōtrary
The Roman Church in particular was forewarned, that she
also,

also, nay the whole Church of the Gentils might fall if they
 lookt not to ther standing. Pag. 338. lin. 11. speaking agaynst
 the priuiledge of infallibility of the Roman Church,
Me thinks (you say) S. Paul writing to the Romans could
 not but haue congratulated this their priuiledge to them, had
 he acknowledged, that their sayth was the rule for all the world
 for euer. But then sure he would haue forborne to put them in
 feare, that they, nay the whole Church of the Gentiles, if they
 did not looke to their standing, might fall away to infidelity,
 as the Iewes had done. Cop. 3. n. 30. in fine. It is in the power
 of the Church to deuiate from this Rule, being nothing else
 but an aggregation of men, of which euery one has free will, &
 is subiect to passion and error. This your reason conuin-
 ceth, if your suppositiō be true, to wit, that the Church
 is NOTHING else but meere men left to their nature hauing
 freewill, subiect to passion and error. But for my part I did
 euer and shall still belieue, that no true Christian will
 be so profane, as to thinke that in the Church there is
 freewill without diuine grace; nothing but nature sub-
 iect to passion and error, without the spirit of God gui-
 ding them into all truth; the Church being the mysti-
 call Body animated with his spirit, which she shall ne-
 uer abandone.

16. Nor doth S. Paul fright the whole Church of Rome,
 much lesse the whole Church of the Gentils with possibi-
 lity of falling away into Infidelity, but sayes in the sin-
 gular number (r) *thou standest by fayth, be not high minded,*
but feare, to shew that he speaketh of euery single Chri-
 stian, that he may fall away from the faith; on the other
 side, he sayth in the plurall nūber (s) *Your fayth is declared*
in the whole world: which words the Fathers (1) vnder-
 stand to signify, that the fayth of the Romans shall euer
 be an infallible rule of Fayth to the rest of the Christian

crificio;
 vt cum
 Altaria
 solem-
 niter
 aptaren-
 tur pre-
 ferrent
 illi ima-
 ginem &
 sic Sa-
 crificiū
 offerre-
 tur.
 Optat.
 lib. 3. cir-
 ca finem:
 2. Edition
 pag. 331.
 lin. 9.
 2. Edition
 pag. 322.
 lin. 15.
 (r) Rom.
 11.
 (s) Rom.
 1. 4.
 (t) Hie-
 ron. A-
 polog ad-
 uers. Rof-
 Seito
 Roma-
 nam fi-
 dem hu-
 iusmodi
 præsti-
 gias non
 recipe-
 re, &
 Paulian-

thorita-
temuni-
tam, non
posse
mutari.

(u) Rom.
16. 17.

(x) Radi-
cem &
matri.
cem Ec-
clesiæ Ca-
tholiæ.
Cyp Ep.
45.

(z) Infra
c. 7. conu.

Church. But more cleerly afterward in the end of his epistle; (u) *Note such as make dissensions against the doctrine you have receaved*: signifying that the Church of Rome hath the office to note & censure all Hereticks, that shall rayse discord in the Church agaynst the Roman Tradition of fayth. And incontinently he sheweth the privilege of Diuine efficacions assistance not to erre in this office, saying, *And the God of peace shal crush Satan vnder your feet with speed.* What is this, but the God of peace hath made the Church of Rome the head and roote of peace and vnity (as (x) the Fathers terme it) to the rest of the Church, to crush Satan, that is (sayth Origen) *euery contradictions spirit that teacheth agaynst the doctrine of Tradition*, vnder their feete? Which speach hath no small allusion to the Reference vsed by Catholicke Christians to the feete of S. Peters Successour. If you had any text in Scripture but halfe as cleere agaynst the infallible authority of the Roman Church and Bishop, as this is for it, your triumphing vociferations that the text is cleere as the sunne, would hardly be containd vnder the cope of heauen. This appeareth by your vrging the place, *Be not high minded, but feare*, as threatening the whole Church of Rome with possibility of falling from Christ; which, seing you could not do without inuoluing in the same damnation and defectibility the whole Church of the Gentiles, you professe the whole Church of God may fall away into Infidelity agaynst the promises of Christ, (z) yea agaynst what your selfe affirme an hundred tymes.

That



*That scripture is not the onely Meanes, or Rule to
know all necessary truths: or that all necessary
things are not evidently contayned in
Scripture.*

CHAP. III.

I. **I**N this Chapter I lay the axe to the roote of your vnfruitfull tree couered with greene leaues of assertions without any branch or bow of strong prooffe. I digge vp the ruinous foundation of your Babilonickall building of confused language full of doctrines different, yea opposit the one to the other; I shall demonstrate that you mistake the Protestant sense of this their principle, *The Scripture is the onely Rule*, or, *All necessary points of fayth are cleerly contayned in Scripture*; that you vnderstand not the state of the Controuersy betwixt vs and them about *Tradition vnwritten*; that you runne headlong on with this principle in your mouth without any bit of true sense, or Christian beliefe, stumbling agaynst all the Articles of Christianity, whereby you get many new noble victories ouer your selfe, by falling downe in flat contradiction vpon your selfe.

2. To vnderstand this we must obserue, that a thing may be containd *most cleerly* to the seeming in some text of Scripture taken *singly* by it selfe, which yet if places of Scripture be *conferred*, and all things considered, is but *darkely* and doubtfully deliuered therein. For example, by the saying of *S. Luke*, that *Ioseph* the husband of the Virgin Mary, was the Sonne of *Hely*; it seemes most cleere and euident that *Hely* was his true and naturall father; neyther would any Christian haue doubted thereof, had not *S. Matthew* written that *Iacob* begat *Ioseph* the husband of Mary; so that the two texts, which taken by themselves seeme most cleere, being conferred together, do mutually darken & obscure ech other. This truth supposed the doctrine of Protestants about the question, *whether all poynts of necessary fayth be containd in Scripture*, consists in two assertions, in the one they agree, in the other they disagree from vs.

(y) D.
field of
the
Church
lib. 4. c.
16. item.
c. 14.

3. First they teach that all necessary things of Fayth are not containd cleerly in Scripture vnderstood by conference of places, but for the clearing of ambiguities, *the Rule of fayth* deliuered by Tradition is necessary; which Rule comprehends all poynts of fayth which haue beene alwayes notoriously knowne, and explicitly belieued of all Christians. Thus farre they and we consent. *There is (y) sayth D. Field* betwixt our Aduersaries and vs, *no difference in this matter*; for we confesse, that neyther conference of places, nor consideration of antecedentia and consequentia, nor looking into the Originals ARE OF ANY FORCE, *unlesse we find the things we conceaue to be vnderstood, and meant in the places interpreted to be consonant to the rule of fayth &c.* neyther is there any of our Deuines that teach otherwise. Thus he.

4. Secondly, Protestants teach that all necessary points

points of fayth are cleerly contayned in Scripture, in some text or texts of Scripture cleer and conspicuous, taken by themselves; so that though we need the rule of Tradition, that we may assuredly vnderstand the Scriptures cōferred together, yet not to deliuer vnto vs some necessary matters of fayth (z) which are no wayes deli- uered in Scripture. Heerin there is some disagreement betwixt them and vs, because we hold that some verities of necessary beliefe cannot be proued by any text of Scripture, sufficiently to be a matter of fayth, by that sole prooffe without the help of Tradition. Now you agree neither with Protestants nor with vs: you maintayne that *all necessary things are evidently certayne in Scripture*, expounded by conference of places without any rule of *Tradition* interpretation; yea you contend that no such rule is extant. This you do not as Protestants do, to establish the totall sufficiency & clarity of Scriptures about the receaued articles of Christian fayth, but to overthrow totally all explicite belief of any Christian mystery whatsoeuer, as by the ensuing Conuiction of your errour from your owne sayings will manifestly appeare. For whiles you endeauour to spread this Infidelity couertly vnder the maske of a *Protestant*, or of a *Christian*, for want of consideration, memory and wit, yon euery where contradict your selfe; affirme, and deny; say, and vn say; build, and vnbuild.

The first Conuiction.

5. **T**HUS you write cap. 2. n. 159. lin. 9. *The bookes of Scripture are not so much of the being of Christian Doctrine, as requisit to the well being thereof: men may be saved without believing the Scripture to be the Word of God, much more without believing it to be a rule and perfect rule of fayth.*

Field. lib. 4. c. 14. We do not so make Scripture the rule of our fayth, as we neglect the other (of Tradition:) nor so admit the other as to detract any thing from the plenitude of Scripture, in which all things are contayned that must be believed.

fayth. And cap. 2. n. 33. lin. 7. If men aid believe the doctrine
 containd in Scripture it would no way hinder their saluation
 not to know, whether there were any Scripture, or no. Those
 barbarous nations S. Irenæus speakes of were in this case; yet no
 doubt they might be saued. Tea, say (b) you, though they had
 rejected the bookes of Scripture proposed vnto them by all the
 rest of the Church which receaued them, I do not doubt but
 they might be saued, God requiring of vs vnder payne of dam-
 nation, onely to believe the verities therein containd, and
 not the diuine authority of the bookes wherein they are con-
 tained. Thus you, destroying your Principle, that Scrip-
 ture is the onely rule, and the onely safe way to heauen, as I
 proue by three arguments, from these words which
 indeed are euident truths. The first argument: Christian
 fayth cannot be ruled and guided to saluation, and at-
 taine to heauen without the onely rule, without the
 onely guide, without the onely meanes. No man in his
 wits can deny this: Now you say, men may attaine by
 fayth vnto saluation without Scripture, though they
 be wholly ignorant of Scripture (as you truly say with
 vs) yea though they actually reiect Scripture, and re-
 fuse to be ruled by it, though the same be proposed to
 them by the whole Church (as you say without vs, and
 truth:) Ergo, Scripture is not the only rule, and meanes
 of Saluation.

6. Hence you contradict your self, when you say.
 To (c) reiect Christ, or to deny the Scripture is such an heresy,
 the beliefe of whose contrary is necessary, not only necessitate
 præcepti, sed medi; and therefore is so absolutely destructive
 of saluation, that no ignorance can excuse it, so that the Church
 may most truly be said to perish, if she Apostate from Christ
 absolutely, or directly reiect the Scripture; denying it to be the
 word of God. Thus you: so contrracting you selfe, that

if what here you write so absolutly be true, your doctrine, that men wholly ignorant of Scripture, yea though they reiect and deny it to be Gods word, may be laued, is not only *heresy damnable in it selfe*, but also *Heresy Apostaticall*, so absolutly, and *indispensably destructive of saluation*, as no ignorance can excuse it. You are a fit man to teach others *the safe way of saluation*, who by your owne words are conuincd to runne a way *absolutly destructive of saluation*.

7. The second argument. If the diuine authority of the Scripture be the only rule and guide of fayth, then it is so appointed of God, and God requireth of men, that they should belieue Scripture to be their rule as being his infallible word, & his only doctrine. But you say, God requires not, that men belieue the diuine Authority of Scripture, yea they may reiect this light and the direction therof, without doing against any diuine ordinance, or appointment: How then is Scripture the only rule of fayth, the only meanes and way to saluation? except you will say it is the rule appointed not of God, but by your selfe, & the deep wisdom of your excellent wit. We shall doubtlesse be well guided, and be sure not so misse, if we follow you for our guide: you will teach vs to goe euery way, yea contrary wayes at once, *to belieue contradictions at the same tyme*. Consider, I pray you, this your saying now refuted, how contrary the same is to what you write *cap. 6. n. 54. in fine*, where you set downe the totall Summe of your new chosen Religion. I am fully assured, that God does not, and therefore that men ought not to require any more of any man, but this; *To belieue the Scripture to be the word of God; to endeaour to find the true sense therof; and to liue according to it.* —

Quo te Mæripedes? Quæ te viâ ducet ad Orcum?

You goe contrary wayes, yet both be damnable errors, and lead directly to Hell. One way to damnation is, believing that God doth require nothing els, no more then, that we believe the Scripture to be his word, not the verities containd therein, but only that we endeavour to find them. This way you take, and it is your (d) new wise choyce, the only (e) rock of rest for the sole of your foot, wearied with a long search of the true way to eternall happinesse. You haue indeed found rest, not for the foot of your soule, but for the sole of your foot; because your Religion newly chosen hath no footing in your soule, but only

(d) Cap.
6. n. 57.
I am ve-
rily per-
suaded
that I
haue wi-
sely cho-
sen after
a long
delibe-
ration.

(e) After
a long
vnpar-
tiall
search I
cannot
find any
rest for
the sole
of my
foot but
vpon
this
rock
only.

Ventosa lingua, pedibusq; fugacibus. —

Hence your sole in your foot wearied to stand longe vpon any persuation, flies from this way, God requires of vs, that we believe the Scripture to be his word, and no more, to the playne contrary, That God requires of vs that we believe the verities contained in Scripture, not the diuine authority of Scripture, or, that it is his word. Betwixt these two contraries you fly from the one to the other, without any rest or end.

8. Poore wearied, commiserable creature! One of those wauering babes tosed this way and that way with euery gust of different fancies. Behold the only rock of rest for Christian fayth is offered you in your owne words, you haue it if you know what you say, if you will not stand ouer by proud ignorance, but vnderstand, or stand with humble beliefe, vnder this your owne saying, *Scripture is not so much of the being of Christian Doctrine, as requisite to the well being thereof.* For on this Catholicke saying of inuincible truth, I ground my third argument, and by it proue, that not so much the being

written

written in Scripture, as the Being taught by the Church, is the rule to know which is the Christian Doctrine, and to believe it. For the *Being* proposed and taught externally is requisite not to the well being only, but to the very being of Christian Doctrine; because it cannot be credible, and fit to be believed of Christian men, except it be externally proposed and taught them to be of God by some credible witnesse. But the *Being* taught, which is so much of the being of Christian Doctrine, is not the being taught in Scripture: For this is requisite but to the well being thereof, as you say. Ergo, besides being written and taught by Scripture, another external being taught is requisite, which is of the very essence of Christian doctrine, which makes the same credible, and fit to be believed, and this can be no other but the *Being* taught by the Church of Christ, the pillar and ground of truth. So that the rocke, the solid, firme, substantiall reason of believing Christian Doctrine, is the *Being* taught by the Church; and the *Being* written in Scripture is requisite, to the well being thereof, because we believe it better, and more assuredly when we find that which is taught by the Church to be also written in Scripture, though this be not absolutely necessary to the constitution of Christian Doctrine. Behold what is contayned in your words: *Hoc fac & vines; hic sta & quiesces*: follow the counsell of S. Austin (f) which I haue noted for you in the margent, and abandon that sandy banck, an imaginary rocke, the Scripture is the only rule of fayth, from which you are carried away into a sea of inconstant swelling fancies, which fight together like waues to the dissolution of ech other.

(f) Si iam satis tibi iam status videris, finemque huiusmodi laboribus vis impone-re, sequere viam Catholice discipline, quæ ab ipso Christo per Apostolos ad nos usque manavit. de util.

The Church conquerant
The second Conuiction.

9. **T**HIS Conuiction I ground vpon this truth^e that Scripture cannot proue it selfe to be the word of God : which truth you deliuer *ca. 2. n. 46. That the Diuinity of a writing cannot be knowne from it selfe alone, but by some extrinsecall authority you need not proue: for no wise man denies it. But then, this authority is that of vniuersall Tradition, not of your Church.* From this truth by you granted, I thus argue: That cannot be the onely rule, or by it selfe alone a rule of fayth, which is not of it selfe able to proue and shew that which it contaynes to be the word of God. For the matter of Christian Faith being the word of God onely, that which cannot shew it selfe to be the word of God, cannot shew it selfe to be matter of Christian fayth. But Scripture alone by it selfe, cannot proue it selfe, nor consequently the doctrine it contaynes to be the word of God, but to this end needeth the *extrinsecall Authority of Tradition.* Therefore not Scripture alone, but Scripture ioyned with the extrinsecall authority of Tradition is the rule of fayth.

10. This defect of Scripture, in respect of being the onely rule, or by it selfe alone any rule of fayth, you lay open, *cap. 2. n. 8. lin. 7. Though a writing could not be proued to vs to be a perfect rule of fayth by its owne saying so (for nothing is proued true by being said or written in a booke) but onely by Tradition which is a thing credible of it selfe : yet it may be so in it selfe.* Thus you. I would gladly know, how can Scripture be the onely rule of fayth, or by it selfe any rule of fayth, if nothing be proued true, nothing shewed to be the word of God barely by being written therein, but onely by the light of Tradition, ioyned vnto Scripture?

11. Hence

11. Hence I inferre, if Scripture by it selfe without Tradition cannot be a rule of Fayth, nor shew any doctrine to be of God; how much lesse can it be a rule of fayth against the vniuersal Tradition of the Church? It is deep vanity in you, and dull inconsideration of the consequences of your doctrine, to boast as you do *cap. 3. n. 40.* that by Scripture you can confute the Church which taught you Scripture to be the word of God, *as wel (say you) as of my Maister in Physicke or the Mathematickes, I may learne those rules and principles by which I may confute his erroneous Conclusions.* Thus you, who verily are such a maister you speake of. For you deliuer rules and principles by which you may be confuted your selfe. For do not you often inculcate this Principle, that the Scripture is knowne to be the word of God only *by Tradition, onely by the testimony of the ancient Churches?* If then you proue by Scripture any Tradition of the anciēt Church, to be against Scripture, you shall not proue *that Tradition* of the Church to be against the word of God; but that you haue no sure ground to belieue the Scripture to be of God: and that you were vnwise to belieue it vpon the warrant of Tradition, as you say you do. For the rule which may be false in one thing, cannot be a sure ground of beliefe in any thing. May I learne this lesson of my good Maister your booke, which being your scholler, hath taught me many rules and principles by which I might confute his maister? *Pag. 5. lin. 23. The meanes to decide Contreuerſies in Fayth and Religion must be endued with vniuerſall infallibility, in whatſoeuer it propeundeth as a diuine truth: For if it may be false in one thing of this nature, we can yeld vnto it but a wauering and fearfull assent in any thing.* Thus you Wherefore if Tradition be not endued with vniuersall infallibility, if it may be false in

any one thing it proposeth for diuine truth, it cannot be belieued with firme assent in any thing at all. Now the principles of *Physicke* or *Mathematicks* are belieued because euident of themselues and not vpon the bare word, tradition, and authority of the maister. For a scholler if he be not assured of those rules & principles, otherwise then by the word of his maister, cannot by the authority of these rules and principles proue any thing against his maister, but onely against himselfe, that he is a foole, eyther in belieuing these rules vpon his Maisters bare word, or else in thinking he can by those rules conuince his maister of falshood. In like sort you shew small iudgement & discretion, who persuaade your selfe you are able to proue some Church-Tradition to be against the word of God by Scriprure, which Scripture you belieue to be the word of God *onely* vpon the warrant of vniuersall Church Tradition, for this is a thing impossible and implicatory, as any *considering man will see*: wherefore not only Scripture, but Scripture ioyned with Tradition is a rule of Fayth, & consequently it is not possible to confute any Church-Tradition by Scripture.

The third Conuiction.

12. **T**HIS conuiction is grounded on this truth, that vnlearned men cannot be assured they haue the incorrupt text, or the true Translatiō of Scripture, but onely by the word of the Church. This you affirme pag. 79. lin. 7. *It were altogether as abhorrent from the goodnesse of God, and repugnant to it, to suffer an ignorant lay mans soule to perish, meerly for being mislead by an indiscernable false Translation, which yet was commended vnto him by the Church, which (being of necessity to credit*

2. Edi..
pag. 75.
lin. 36.

dit some in this matter) he hath reason to rely upon, either
 aboue all other, or as much as any other; as it is to damne
 a penitent sinner for a secret defect in that desired absolu-
 tion. Thus you, from which I conuince two thinges:
 First, that the Scripture is not the rule: Secondly that
 the Church must of necessity be still visible and infalli-
 ble in guiding men to heauen. The first I proue in this
 fort. The only rule of fayth must be for the capacity of
 all men aswell vnlearned as learned, simple as iudi-
 cious, occupied in worldly affaires as disoccupied. The
 only rule I say must be able to assure all men of the
 Scripture, that the Text and the Translation thereof is
 not corrupt in any substantiall matter. But Scripture is
 not able to do this, as you do confesse, and consequent-
 ly there is a necessity, that men vnlearned, men of meane
 capacity, men occupied in worldly affaires, trust the
 Church. Ergo, not Scripture alone, but Scripture ioyned
 vnto the authority of the Church, is the rule of fayth.

13. Secondly, that the Church is visible and an infal-
 lible guide, I proue. You say, *It is repugnant to the good-
 nesse of God, to suffer the soules of men to perish for their tru-
 sting the Church, which they had reason to trust aboue all o-
 ther, being of necessity to trust some.* If this be true (and it
 is most true) then God is bound in his goodnesse to pro-
 uide, that the Church which is to be trusted aboue all
 other, be not so bidden as it cannot without extreme
 difficulty be found; nor fallible, that it cannot without
 extreme danger be trusted: For as you say pag. 337. n. 10. 2. Edit.
 lin. 23. *A doubtfull and questionable guide is as good as none* cap. 5. n.
 at all. Is it then impious to thinke, that men being in ne-^{20. pag.}
 cessity of a guide to heauen and for want of one in ter-^{322. li. 4.}
 mes of perishing eternally, God hath commended and
 commanded vnto them for their guide, a doubtfull &
 questio-

questionable Church which men neyther know where to find, nor being found how to trust.

14. What you say of a *penitent sinner*, that God will not *damne him for the secret defect in his desired absolution*, because his *Ghostly Father* was perhaps an *Atheist* and could not, or a *villaine* and would not give him absolution. First you are deceaued in thinking, that a secret *Atheist* cannot give absolution; for he may, if he haue intention to do what Christ instituted: and this intention he may haue, though he esteeme of that institution no better then of a foppery. As for a *Villaine*, it is not credible, that any *Christian Priest* will be such a villaine, as not to give his *Penitent* absolution: in which case if (perhaps it fall out) we thinke God of his goodnes will not permit such a *Penitent* to perish: yet the case being rare & extraordinary, he hath appointed no ordinary meanes of succour, but he will supply such defects (as he many wayes may easily do) by his speciall prouidence. Now the necessity of Christians for the defect in their assurance of the true text of Scripture, and vncorrupt translation is continuall, ordinary, and it implies incertainty in all matters of fayth, in respect of all Christians. For there be scarre any that can assure themselues of the true Text, or of the truth of the Translation they vse, by searching into the Originalls and ancient copies. Wherefore. God hath prouided for them an ordinary meanes of assurance, continually at hand, and for the capacity of all, to wit a Church infallible, and so conspicuous as shee may be seene of all.

The fourth Conuiction.

15. **A** Nother Principle you deliuer c. 3. n. 33. li. 10. wherein you cōtradict your selfe & depriue Scripture of being the only, or the prime Christian rule of fayth. I must learne of the Church, or of some part of the Church, or I cānot know any thing Fundamentall or not Fundamentall. For how can I come to know, that there was such a man as Christ, that he taught such doctrine, that he & his disciples did such miracles in confirmation of it, that the Scripture is the word of God, unlesse I be taught it. So that the Church is, though not a certain foundation and prooffe of my Fayth, yet a necessary introduction to it. Thus you, and in like manner you make the Creed contayning all Fundamental articles of simple beleeve independent of Scripture. Cap. 4. n. 15. The certainty I haue of the Creed, that it was from the Apostles, and contaynes the principles of fayth I ground it not upon Scripture &c. But the contrary to this in formall termes you affirme. Cap. 3. n. 37. lin. 9. saying of Protestants, They ground their beleeve, that such and such things only are Fundamental on Scripture only, & goe about to proue their assertion by Scripture only. Behold contradiction vpon contradiction. For to say you ground your beleeve of the Fundamental articles or Principles of fayth not vpon Scripture, and you ground it on Scripture only, is direct contradiction. What you say that you beleeue such and such things only to be fundamental & proue it by Scripture, is repugnant with what you contest more then in an hundred passages of your Booke, that you neyther know, nor can know exactly which points be Fundamental.

16. But omitting your contradiction, I conuince that Scripture cānot be the rule of our faith about Fundamen-

Cap. 2. n.
43 circa.
finem.

talls, which must of necessity be knowne and believed before Scripture, I proue by what you write, Pag. 70. lin. 29. If our understanding did assent already to what
,, purpose, should the Scripture do that which was done
,, before? Nay indeed how is it possible it should be so, any
,, more then a Father can beget a sonne, that he hath al-
,, ready? or an Architect build an house that is built al-
,, ready? Or then this very world can be made againe,
,, before it be vnmade: *Transubstantiation* indeed is fruit-
,, full of such monsters. But they that haue not swor-
,, ne themselues to the defence of errour, will easily
,, perceauē that *iam factum facere*, and, *factum infe-*
ctum facere, be equally impossible. These be your wor-
des, from which I thus argue: The Scripture can-
not be the rule and reason of believing such points of
fayth, which must of necessity be believed before we
can receaue Scripture. But before we believe Scripture,
we must believe the fundamentall articles of Christia-
nity, *that Christ was, and taught such and such doctrine* es-
sential to the Gospell; that he chose Apostles to preach
it, who confirmed it with new miracles, and left it vs
written in these bookes of Scripture: These thinges and
the like you confesse must of necessity be knowne vpon
the Tradition and Authority of the Church before we
can believe Scripture. *Ergo*, the assent we yield vnto
the truth of these articles, is not by Scripture but by the
Churches Tradition precedently to our beliefe of
Scripture. And so the Church teaching vs the Chri-
stian Tradition is the fundamentall and essentiall rule
of fayth, and the Scripture is requisite not to the being
of Christian fayth, nor for the begetting thereof, but
only *ad melius esse*, to the wel being thereof, to confirme
vs more & more in what we are taught by the Church.

The fifth Conuiction.

17. **C** *Ap. 2. n. 19. (2) lin. 15.* you write, *In all the*
Controuerfies of Protestants betwixt them (a) For
 selues, there is a seeming conflict of Scripture with so should
 Scripture, reason with reason, authority with authori it be
 ty; which how it can subsist with manifest reuealing of though
 the truth, I cannot well vnderstand. And *cap. 1. n. 13. lin. the*
 25. *The contrary* beliefe may be concerning points, booke
 wherein Scripture may with so great probability be al n. 9.
 leadged on both sides (which is a sure note of a point,,
 not necessary) that men of honest and vpright hrearts,,
 true louers of God, and the truth, such as desire aboue,,
 all thinges to know Gods will and to do it, may with,,
 out any fault at all, some goe one way, and some ano,,
 ther; and some (and those as good men as any of the,,
 former) suspend their iudgment and expect some *Elias*,,
 to solve doubts, and reconcile repugnances. And *Priface n.,,*
 30. *There is no more* certaine signe, that a thing is not e,,
 uident, then that honest vnderstanding and indifferent,,
 men, after a mature deliberation of the matter, differ a,,
 bout it. From this your confession, that there be see-
 ming contradictions and conflicts of one part of Scri-
 pture with another, which set good and honest men of
 your stampe together by the eares, I gather three argu-
 ments, which conuince that Scripture by it selfe cannot
 be the only rule of fayth. First, That cannot be a rule of
belieuing with is incredible it selfe. But Scripture being
 seemingly contrary to it selfe and contradicting it selfe,
 is by it selfe incredible, therefore it cannot be a rule of
 fayth by it selfe; but to be a rule of fayth it must be
 made credible by some *extrinsecall Authority*, with is so
 worthy of credit, as vpon the warrant therof we may

believe things incredible which is as you grant the rule of *uniuersall Tradition*.

18. Secondly that cannot be the only rule, or by it selfe a rule of Christian fayth, with is not able to assure vs about the chiefeft articles of our fayth, as the *Trinity*, *Incarnation*, *Real presence*, the knowledge whereof is for Christians essentially necessary vnto saluation. For if Christ Iesus be the true God consubstantiall to his father, then Heretiques, to wit *Socinian* and *Arian* Protesters against the Church of *Rome*, cannot be saued by Christ, seeing they refuse to believe and worship him as the true God. On the other side, if Christ be not the true God, then Roman Catholiques cannot be saued by the true God, seeing they were worshippers of a false God. Now this article that *Christ Iesus is the true God*, so absolutely necessary, cannot be proued vnto them by Scripture only: for about this poynt (a) Scriptures are alleaged with so great probability on both sides, that of learned Christians honest and vnderstanding men, esteemed pious, religious, true louers of God and his truth, Pastours and guides in the Christian Church; some haue gone one way, some another as is notorious. Wherefore, what you say, that this so probable allegation of Scriptures on both sides is a sure signe of a poynt not necessary, implies Atheisme, to wit, that it doth not import Christians to know whether in worshipping Christ Iesus as the true God, they be not worshippers of a false God. And if this be Atheisme, the is it blasphemy to say that Scripture onely is the rule of Christian fayth, and that Christians cannot be assured of any doctrine whereof they be not assured by the rule of Scripture onely. For it is euident truth, and vndereniable (though other Protesters against vs, will not confesse

(a) Arius did alleage against the God head of Christ 40 places of Scripture and Catholiques alleage no fewer.

confesse it so cleerely as you doe) that where there is a seeming conflict of Scripture with Scripture , where Scripture is alleadged on both sides with so great probability, that learned , vnderstanding and indifferent men differ about it; it is cleere I say, that about such points there cannot be any decision of controuerfies by Scripture onely.

19. Thirdly by defending the Scripture to be the onely rule (besides this blasphemy, that Christians by their rule of fayth cannot be assured, that they be not worshipers of a false God) you are forced to adde another; that on God and his word *the fault lyeth* that there be so many factions of fayth, and so great dissension amongst *vpright hearted Protestants*; for that these your true louers of God and his truth stand for *contrary belief*, that in matters of Religion Christendome is deuided into Factions and Sects , that *some go one way and some another*, curting and damning ech other to Hell, is no doubt a great fault, a mighty scandall, an huge mischiefe, which must of necessity lye heauily either vpon such *Diuisioners*, or vpon God But you excuse the Diuisioners, saying that (b) *they goe some one way, some another, without any fault at all.* Ergo, the whole fault must rest (b) *Cap. 1. n. 13.* on God, who gaue to these true louers of him & his truth the Scripture for their onely rule, which being it selfe as you say *seemingly factious, contradiction*, and one part therof *fighting* agaynst another set these innocent, honest, vpright hearts together by the eares, one with the other, in good earnest, and implacably. Thus to excuse Protestants, you protest against God, that he is not the God of peace, but of dissension, and the authour of all the discord among Christians in matter of Religion, and of all the mischiefs, that are consequent thereupon

by giuing a Scripture so full of *seeming conflicts* for the sole rule of their fayth. The day will come, that these boasters of their *honest and upright heart, of their true love to God and his truth*, shall find the Apostles saying true, *Not who commendes himselfe, but whome God commendes, he is approued.* They shall see that in their trusting *onely the Scripture, and their owne reason* in expounding it, contemning the Tradition of the Church, they were not louers of God & his truth, but fast freinds to their owne fancy and fond conceits, louers of themselves, adorers of their owne poore miserable wit.

The sixth Conuiction.

20. **T**Hough we were sure that the Scripture is the word of God, that we haue the incorrupt text, the true translation thereof cleered from seeming contradictions; yet for all this, Scripture could not be to vs a rule of fayth alone by it selfe, by reason of the high senses of Scripture, incredible and incomprehensible to humane reason. This I proue by your owne writing, wherein you deliuer a grand Catholique verity, which ouerthrowes the Scriptures being the onely rule. Protestants pretend they know their doctrine and interpretation of Scripture to be the word of God, by the diuine light and euident certainty thereof: you will not belieue this resolution to be theirs, and affirme the contrary *cap. 6. n. 5. That the Scripture is not euidently certaine, nor of it selfe disuested of the motiues of credibility euidently credible. For Protestants (say you) are not so vaine as to pretend that all men do assent to it, which they would do, if it were euidently certaine, nor so ridiculous as to imagine, if an Indian who had neuer heard of Christ should by chance find a Bible in his owne language, that he would by reading it with-*
out

out miracle certainly believe it to be the word of God, which he could not choose if it were evidently credible. Thus you, and hence I thus argue.

21. That Authority cannot be of it selfe, and by it selfe alone the rule and guide of Christian saving fayth in the vnderstanding and believing of Scripture, which is not of it selfe evidently credible, and worthy of all credit. This I proue because the rule and reason to believe the Scripture, must be able to conuince the vnderstanding, and to resolute it to believe many high and incomprehensible mysteries. For these are taught and deliuered in Scripture, and must be believed by euery Christian that will be saved. But an authority which of it selfe is not evidently credible, or worthy of all credit is not of it selfe a sufficient reason, or a good rule for me to believe incredible things, incomprehensible to my humane reason, as is manifest to euery man that hath wit to apprehend the sense of this speech. Ergo the Scripture alone, & by it selfe not ioyned with the evidently credible authority of some other witnessle cannot be the rule of fayth. This may be made manifest by examples, as by this; What the Scripture sayth, *A sonne of thirty yeares was David, when he began to reigne, and he reigned forty yeares*, I easily believe in the plaine sense, because there is no incredibility therein. But whē the Scripture sayth *a sonne of one yeare was Saul when he began to reigne, and he reigned two yeares*, the incredibility of the sense (the Scripture in other places assuring me, that whē he began to reigne he was higher by head & shoulders then any man in *Israel*) makes me presently stagger, and to seeke for some stronger pillar then the euidence of the text in my priuate seeming; and finding none, my reason is presently overcome, and wone to forsake

forfake the seeming euidence of the the text. The same no doubt would happen in other texts of Scripture about the B. Trinity, Incarnation, and other mysteries of fayth; My fayth, I say, would giue backe had I no stronger rule and reason of belieuing them, then the euidence of the text in my priuate Iudgement. But whē I perceauē the euidence of the text in my priuate Iudgement, to be vpheld and confirmed by the Iudgement of the Catholique Church, which did euer vnderstand & belieue such texts in that incredible and incomprehensible sense; then am I fully confirmed and Christianly resolved to belieue those high senses, though neuer so impossible to the seeming of my reason; becaule tradition, or *traditine Interpretation*, as you speake, that is, the perpetuall doctrine and beleefe of Christians in all former ages is able to ouercome all incredulity which the incredibility of the thing may represent vnto reaso.

Cap. 2. n. For it is (as you are forced to confesse) *the rule to iudge*
 25. & ca. *all controuersies by*, being Gods infallible word evidently
 3. n. 45. credible of it selfe, and so a fit rule whereon Christian fayth may rely; for what witnesse can be more illustrious and knowne, and of more eminent credit, then the Church founded by Christ Iesus and his Apostles, bathed with the blood of innumerable Martyrs, adorned by the glorious liues and miracles of millions of holy men?

22. I confesse the Protestants opinion, that the doctrine of Scripture is to them eident, that they see the truth thereof, as cleerely as they do the light of the sunne, to be absurd, fond, ridiculous as you rearme it. But also I must acknowledge, that they speake consequently, otherwise they could not say their fayth doth finally rest on the Scripture, nor pretend the Scripture

to be their onely rule. And you who reiect this Protestants conceit of the intrinsecall light of Scripture do not onely harbour Infidelity in your heart, but also professe it openly in words, pag. 330. lin. 28. *I deny not, but* 2^d Edit: *I am bound to believe the truth of many texts of Scripture, the* n. 318. *sense whereof is to me obscure, and the truth of many articles of* lin. 24. *fayth, the manner whereof is obscure, and to humane understanding incomprehensible. But then it is to be obserued, that not the sense of such texts, nor the MANNER of such things is that which I am bound to believe, but the truth of them; for that I should believe the truth of any thing, the truth whereof cannot be made euident to me with an euidence proportionable to the fayth required of me: this, I say, for any man to be bound to, is vniust and unreasonable, because to do it is impossible. Thus you professe, that you neither do, nor can believe the incomprehensible mysteries of Christian Religion. For when the manner is the very substance of the mystery, then the very substance is incomprehensible. For example in the B. Trinity that Three, Father, Sonne, and Holy Ghost be One, the mystery is not, that these three names signifie one thing (as Sabellians and Socinians vnderstand it) but that in the vinity of the Godhead there be three Persons distinct, of one substance But you professe not to believe the manner of these mysteries, because it is incomprehensible: Ergo, you do not believe the substance of the mysterie, the substance thereof being a manner of being incomprehensible. Moreouer he is no faythfull Christian, who believes not the articles of Christianity, according to the Christian manner and sense; But the Christian manner of believing them is according as they are incomprehensible to humane vnderstanding, and seeme to prophane Wit and Gentilisme follies and absurdities, as*

1. Cor. 1.
23.

S. Paul doth declare: *Ergo*, you are no Christian who openly shew your selfe ashamed to belieue any MANNER of things revealed by Christ vpon his word, that is incomprehensible, except he make it euident to your vnderstanding; and then if you belieue him he shall be much beholding vnto you for belieuing him; so farre as you see he speakes truth, and no further; that is, so farre as you will trust any liar whatsoeuer. The summe of all is, that seeing you reiect the Puritanical conceipt, that Scripture is knowne to be the word of God by its owne light, as a foolerie (for so really it is) you must either deny the Scripture to be the only rule, or elie continue to professe vnbeliefe of Christianity, and of all manner of incomprehensible mysteries.

The seauenth Conuiction.

23. **Y**OUR Aduersary often vrgeth you to set downe an exact Catalogue of fundamentalls or necessary truths, without the particular and distinct beliefe of which you contend that it *implies contradiction* that any man be saved. You hauing vsed many tergiversations to diuert the mind of the Reader, at last confesse (a) Pag. 23 lin. 8. That it is *an intricate peece of buisnesse, of extreme great difficultie, and of extreme little necessitie, almost impossible.* And pag 134. lin. 8. This variety of circumstances makes it impossible to set downe an exact Catalogue of Fundamentalls. And (b) pag. 201. lin. 23. A Catalogue of Fundamentalls (because to some more is fundamentall, to others lesse, to others none at all) had been impossible. By this confession you ouerthrowe your Principle, that Scripture is the only rule wherein all necessary things are euidently conteyned. For fundamentall points being the essentiall parts of the Gospell, Doctrines

intrin-

*intrinsecall to the covenant betwixt God and man, not only cleerely reuealed, and so certaine truths, but also commanded under payne of damnation to be distinctly knowne and believed of all, and so necessary truths: I demand whether these diuine fundamentall and essentiall lawes about the distinct knowing and believing of these points in particular be cleerely deliuered in Scripture, or not? If not; Ergo, there be some diuine Lawes necessary vnto saluation, without the obseruance of which it implies contradiction any man should be saued, not cleerely deliuered in Scripture. If they be cleerely deliuered, then points fundamental be cleerely discernable from points not fundamentall, as being not only cleerely reuealed in Scripture, as some points not fundamentall may be; but also cleerely commanded vnto the beliefe of all vnder paine of damnation, as vn-fundamentall points cannot be. What more easy for a man that hath eyes then to discern the places of a garden on which the Sunne shineth, from those on which it shineth not, but are shaded from his beames? When light from heauen shined on the howles and habitations of the *Israëlites*, and not on the houies and habitations of the *Aegyptians*, was it an intricate peece of butinesse for a man not blind, to haue discerned the one from the other? But you affirme often and earnestly, that it is a thing of extreme great difficulty, yea morally impossible to distinguish in Scripture things fundamentall from things not fundamentall. Ergo, they are not cleerely commaunded in Scripture, and consequently some things necessary, to wit, some diuine commandes of fayth, the obseruance of which is fundamentall to the covenant betwixt God and man for their Saluation, are not contayned in Scripture at all; or else only intricately and obscurely.*

Cap. 4. 48
4. lin. 39.

Cap. 6. 14
fine.

Exod 10.

(a) Cap.
4. n. 40.
6. n. 49.
lin. 4.

Cap. 4. n.
42.

The Church Conquerant
The eighth Conviction.

24. **B**Y the discovery of this contradiction your cheefe, or rather onely argument for the sufficiency of Scripture is answered. (a) *Pag. 210. lin. 28. & 4. n. 40. pag. 212. lin. 1.* you affirme, that in the sole Ghospell of S. *Cap. 4. n. 43. Luke* all necessary things are contayned; so that in other bookes of Scripture, (b) namely in the Ghospell of S. *(b) Cap. 4. n. 42. Iohn*, whatsoever is revealed ouer and aboue that in S. *Luke*, is indeed profitable truth, but not necessary or fundamentall. This you proue, because S. *Luke* in the entrance to his history of the Acts of the Apostles sayth: *The former treatise haue I made, O Theophilus, of all that Iesus began to do and teach.* This argument you often inculcate, and prosecute with great vehemency and (according to your almost perpetual ridiculous manner of disputing) with a cart load of interrogations; but in fine the substance of all the difficultie is, how could S. *Luke* truly say, that he had written a treatise of all that Iesus began to do and teach, if he haue left some necessary doctrines, and fundamentall matters vnwritten?

25. In this argument you contradict in plainetearmes both S. *Iohn*, and your selfe, shewing your want of Christianity in the one, your want of wit, memory, & consideration in the other. The *Eternall Generation* of Christ whereby he is *the only begotten of God in the bosome of his Father*, is no where cleerely deliuered in the Ghospell of S. *Luke*; yea your *Socinians* collect out of his Ghospell many strong arguments (as they conceaue) against this article of our fayth: And yet the same is cleerely deliuered in the Ghospell of S. *Iohn*, and the beliefe thereof commanded vnto all expressely vnder payne

payne of damnation, *Iohn. 3. 18.* He that belieneth is not iudged, he that belieneth not is already iudged, because he hath not beliened in the name of the only begotten Sonne of God.

(a) How can you belieue in the Ghospell of *S. Iohn*; & not belieue the Eternall Generation of the Sonne of God, and the eternal damnation of the disbelieuers, thereof; and consequently that there is some necessary commanded truth in *S. Iohns* Ghospell about the Ghospell of *S. Luke*?

(a) Also ver. 36.

He that belieueth not the Sonne shall not

26. You also contradict your selfe, and ouerthrow this your so often asserted plenitude of *S. Lukes* Ghospell, by objecting out of the Ghospell of *S. Iohn*, the Precept of Communion in both kinds, as a thing necessary to be knowne, beliened, yea practised of all, aswell of the

see life, but the wrath of God abideth in him.

Clergy, as Laytie: for in prooffe of this (in your conceite) so necessary truth, you produce not any text, word, or syllable out of *S. Luke*. Yea *S. Luke* is so faire from teaching the necessity of both kindes, as he signifies the contrary cleerely inough. For in his narration

Luke 22. v. 19.

of the Eucharist how it was instituted, he doth expressly note, that our Lord deliuering the Sacrament vnder the forme of Bread, said: *Do this in remembrance of me*; but in deliuering the Chalice he makes no mention of any such command. To this institution conformable

was our Lords practice, recorded by (c) *S. Luke*, that in *Emmans* he gaue the two disciples that were laymen, the Eucharist in the forme only of consecrated bread. Nor

(c) *Luke 24. 21.*

is *S. Luke* his saying, that he had written his former treatise of all things *Iesus began to do and teach*, to be restrayned to necessary things onely, his words being all things absolutely without limitation. He writ then all things not only necessary but also profitable, which he iudged fit for the end & purpose of his writing; which

was not (as you fondly imagine) to set out a Catechisme, or brieft Summe of Christian doctrine, but to write such a History of the whole life of our Lord as might serue to confirme, and assure (d) Christians in the beliefe of that forme of Doctrine, in which they had been instructed, catechized, and christened by the Apostles, and other Apostolicall men.

(d) *Luk.*
cap. 1. v.

That
thou
mightst
know
the cer-
tainty of
these
things
wherein
thou
hast
beene
instru-
cted.

(c) *Pag.*
210. lin.
25.

Of all
the
four E-
uange-
lists this
is very
probable
but of
S. Luke
most ap-
parent.

Cap. 4. n.

43.
(f) *Pag.*
212. lin. 2.

27. I conclude this Chapter, with noting the extreme misery, pouerty, futility of your whole booke. Do not you say in your *Preface. n. 34.* that this Principle, *all things necessary are evidently containd in Scripture, is not onely the corner Stone and chiefe pillar, but euen the base and adequate foundation of your answer?* Now this Principle, not being prime, immediate, or euident of it selfe, you haue not brought for it any solide argument or prooffe. The plenitude of the other Ghospels besides *S. Lukes* you dare not so confidently maintayne: you (e) say no more but that it is *very probable*, that in ech of them all necessary things are deliuered; you (f) stand absolutely only vpon the Ghospel of *S. Luke*, that therein *all is containd*; which is so false and vayne as it is contradicted euen by your selfe, nor do any Protestants hold it, but onely *Socinians*, who by pretending this fulnes of *S. Luke* his Ghospel, would put off the necessity of beleeuing the Ghospel of *S. Iohn*, and the high mysteries therof: and so you had good reason to terme this principle by you so stoutly and perpetually auouched, so poorely and miserably proued, *the adequate Base of your Booke.*

That



That there is one visible Society of Christians infallible in all her Proposals, knowne unto all, by subordination to one visible Head, or Pastour.

CHAP. V.

IN prooffe of this Title, omitting many other, I produce only two or three arguments, as well to be briefe, as because these be so full conuincing and well grounded, euen by such an Aduersary as you are, that more will not be required.

The first Conuiction.

1. **I**F the Church be an infallible guide in fundamentals, or which is all one, an infallible teacher of all necessary truth, then is she a certaine Society of Christians of one denomination, of one obedience, subiect to one visible head, infallible in all her Proposals. But the Church is such an infallible teacher of all necessary truth, or such a guide in fundamentals. In this argument both propositions are yours, and I shall set downe your words fully, whereby you not onely deliuer, but also demonstrate them. The *Maier* you acknowledge

knowledge ca. 2. n. 139. You must know, that there is a wide difference betwixt being infallible in *Fundamentals*, and „ being an *infallible guide in Fundamentals*. The former we „ grant, for it is no more but this, that there shall be a „ Church in the world for euer. But we vtterly deny the „ Church to be the later: for to say so, were to oblige our „ selves to find some certaine Society of men; of whome „ we might be certayne, that they neither do, nor can „ erre in fundamentals nor in declaring what is funda- „ mentall and what is not; and consequently to make any „ Church an infallible guide in *Fundamentals* would be „ to make it infallible in all thinges she proposes to be be- „ lieued. This therefore we deny both to your Church, „ & to all Churches of one denomination, that is indeed „ we deny it simply to any Church. For no Church can „ be fit to be a guide, but only a Church of some certain „ denomination. For otherwise no man can possibly „ know which is the true Church, but by a præexamina- „ tion of the doctrine controuerted; and that were not to „ be guided by the Church to the true doctrine, but by „ the true doctrine to the Church. Heereafter therefore „ when you heare Protestants say, *the Church is infallible in „ fundamentalls*, you must not conceaue them, as if they „ meane, as you do, some Society of Christians, which „ may be knowne by adhering to some one Head, for „ example to the *Pope or Bishop of Constantinople &c.* Thus „ you deliuer the sequells of this proposition, *the Church „ is an infallible guide in fundamentalls*, which are in a word „ our whole Catholique doctrine about the Church: „ that if that proposition be by you granted expressely „ and cleerely, yea proued inuincibly from Scripture, you „ must returne againe to the Church of *Rome*, or else by „ your owne iudgment be damned to Hell; specially be- „ cause

cause you repeate the same consequences of the granting of an infallible guide in fundamentalls, and both approue, and proue them Cap. 3. n. 39. lin. 11. Speaking to your Aduersary, Good Sir, you must needes do vs this fauour, to be so acute, as to distinguish between being infallible in Fundamentalls, and being an infallible guide in Fundamentalls. That shee shall be alwayes a Church infallible in Fundamentalls, we easily grant: for it comes to no more but this, that there shall be alwayes a Church. But that there shall be alwayes such a Church which is an infallible guide in Fundamentalls, this we deny. For this cannot be without setting a knowne infallibility in some one knowne Society of Christians, as the Greeke, or the Roman, (or some other Church) by adhering to which guide, men might be guided to belieue aright in all Fundamentalls. A man that were destitute of all meanes of communicating his thoughts to others, might yet in himselfe, and to himselfe be infallible, but he could not be a guide to others. A Man, or a Church that were inuisible, so that none could know how to repayre to it for direction, could not be an infallible guide, and yet he might be vnto himselfe infallible.

2. Thus you haue told vs cleerely and fully what will follow if you grant the Church to be an infallible guide in Fundamentalls: which sequells be so much denyed and detested by you, as one would thinke it were impossible you should be so forgetfull as to affirme it. And yet you do cleerely say, that the Church is not only infallible in Fundamentalls, but also an infallible guide in Fundamentalls, being euen by essence not only a belicuer of all necessary truth, but also a teacher or mistresse thereof: Cap. 2. n. 164. initio. The visible Church shall alwayes WITHOVT FAYLE PROPOSE so much of Gods reuelation as is sufficient to bring men to hea-

uen; for otherwise it will not be the visible Church: yet it may sometymes adde things hurtfull, nay in themselves damnable. And cap. 2. n. 77. in fine, & n. 73. initio, you grant, that the Apostle termeth the Church of God, the pillar and ground of truth, not only because by duty it is still the teacher of all truth, though not so ever in fact, but also, because it alwayes shall and will be so; yet, (say you) this is short to prooue your intent, that the Church is infallible in all her proposals, vnles you can shew, that by Truth is certainly meant not only necessary to Saluatio, but all that is profitable absolutely, & simply ALL. For that the true Church alwayes shall be the MAINTAINER and TEACHER of ALL NECESSARY TRUTH you know we grant and must grant: for it is of the ESSENCE of the Church to be so: and any cōpany of men were no more a Church without it, then any thing can be a man, & not be reasonable. Thus you: Verily were it possible for a creature to be a man, & not reasonable, you deserue to carry away the title of a true vnreasonable man, from all men that hitherto haue ranked themselves in the number of Writers. You are a true man, for that you deliuer manifest truths made good by strong reasons; you are an vnreasonable man, in that you wilfully and obstinately stand in defence of the contrary falshood. I will briefly note first your contradictions, secondly the sequels therof.

3. In the words cited in the first place, you distinguish betwixt a Church *infallible in Fundamentals*, and such a Church as is an *infallible guide in Fundamentals*, granting the true Church to be the former, but not the later, iesting at your Aduersary, as though his confounding them did argue in him want of such an acute Wyt, as you suppose your selfe to haue. But in the second citations you do vs the fauour to be so acute, so perspicacious, so sharpe-sighted, as to penetrate into the very
essence

essence of the Church, and out of that Closet of Truth pronounce, that to be *infallible in Fundamentals*, and to be an *infallible guide in Fundamentals*, be inseparably cō-joyned in the Church; and that to grant the former to the Church and deny the later, were to deuide the Church from its very essence. For I hope you will not be so acute, as to distinguish betwixt an *infallible guide in Fundamentals*, and such a Church as is alwayes in fact without fayle the teacher, the proposer, the maintayner, in a word the mistresse of all necessary truth euen by essence; that she can no more depart from teaching, proposing, and maintayning all fundamentall Christian doctrine, then from her owne being. Nor do you onely so affirme the Churches essentiall infallibility in teaching all Fundamentals, but also prooue the same by the word of God, which proposes the Church of Christ as the pillar and ground of truth, as built on the Rocke against which the gates of Hell shal neuer preuaile. For these words at least euince (as you confesse *Cap. 3. n. 70.* that there shall still continue a true Church, and bring forth children vnto God, & send soules to Heauē: which could not be vnles she did alwayes without fayle teach all necessary truth, & so be an infallible guide in Fundamentals.

4. Now this being a truth infallible, that the Church cannot erre in teaching fundamentals, let vs proceed to note and number the doctrines which you openly grant and proue to be consequent thereupon, which be such as no more could haue byn desired. A *Sicilian* Nobleman, when *Scipio* Prator of that country offered him one wealthy and talkatiue, but of little wit for aduocate of his cause, replied, *I pray you Sir giue this man for Aduocate to my Aduersary; and then I will be content to haue no Aduocate at all.* So we may say that the cause of Prote-

stants about the *Totall of their Religion and Saluation* controuerted with the Church of *Rome*, being abandoned by learned Protestants, none presuming to appeare against euident truth so cleerely demonstrated by *Charity maintayned*, it was the Roman Churches good luck you should preferre your selfe, and be admitted for their Aduocate, for you speake so wisely, so pertinently, so coherently for Protestants, as the Roman Church needs not any other Aduocate in her behalfe. No Catholique Patron, no learned man howsoever well seene in Controuersies of Religion, nay the Author of *Charity mainteyned* himselfe could not haue spoken more fully, groundedly, vnanswerably in the defence of the Roman Catholique Church, then you haue done, while you are perswaded, that you plead against her, as appeareth by these Conclusions, the deduction whereof is confessed and exprest by your selfe.

5. First there is, euer was, and shalbe a true Church visible and conspicuous to the world, that all men according to the will of God may be saued (if they please) by the meanes of her preaching ouer the world. This you grant in saying, that if the Church be an infallible guide in Fundamentals, then *this knowne infallibility, must be settled in some knowne Society of Christians, by adhering to which guide men may be guided to belieue aright in all Fundamentals.* Now as the Apostle sayth, God will haue all men to be saued, and to come to the knowledge of truth, and consequently he will haue the meanes, which proposeth all the truth of Saluation infallibly guiding men to heauē, to be visible, & so diffused in the world as all men may come to see her, and learne of her, and be saued if they will by the grace of Christ Iesus.

6. Secondly this Church being an infallible guide
in

in Fundamentals, must belikewyse infallible in all her proposals in matter of fayth. This sequell, according to your good custome, you both deny and grant. You deny it pag. 177. saying, *that the Church, though she be the ground and rocke of all necessary truth, yet not the rocke and ground, or infallible teacher of all profitable truth, but may erre and mainteyne damnable errorr against it.* But pag. 105. n. 139. you grant the Consequence, saying, *To grant any Church an infallible guide in Fundamentals, would be to make it infallible in all things which she proposes, and requires to be believed:* and Cap. 3. n. 36. you say, *The Church except she be infallible in all things we can belieue her in nothing vpon her word and authority; which you proue by this demonstration vnanswerably, Because, say you, an authority subiect to errorr can be no firme and stable foundation of my beliefe in any thing. And if it were in any thing, then this authority being one & the same in all proposals, I should haue the same reason to belieue all, that I haue to belieue one. And therefore must do vnreasonably eyther in believing any one thing vpon the sole warrant of this authority, or else in not believing all things equally warranted by it.* Behold how earnestly you auerre and forcibly demonstrate what before you did so peremptorily deny, that the Church being the pillar and ground of some Truth, to wit of Truth necessary to Saluation, must of necessity be the pillar & ground of all sauing Truth; because a Church subiect to errorr in some things cannot be the ground and firme foundation of my beleefe in any thing whatsoever.

7. Thirdly, the true Church of Christ, the *pillar and ground of Truth*, to which it is essential to propose, teach, and mayntaine all necessary truth, is one Society of Christians notoriously knowne by subordination to

one vniuersall visible Head or Pastour. This you grant saying, that an infallible guide in Fundamentals, or, which is all one, such a Church as shall alwayes without fayle be the pillar, ground, and teacher of all necessary truth, must be one knowne Society of Christians, by adhering to which we are sure to be guided aright to belieue all Fundamentals; one certaine Society of men by whome we are certaine they neither do, nor can erre in Fundamentals; one certayne Society of Christians which may be knowne by adhering to such a Bishop as their Head.

8. Fourthly there being such an infallible Church in all her doctrines, you suppose that we are not to find out which is the true Church by preexamination of the doctrine controuerted, but by euidence of the marke of subordination to one visible Head find the true Church, by whose teaching we are lead to all necessary truth, if we follow her direction and rest in her Iudgement. These foure sequels you teach to be inuolued and contayned in your grant, that the Church is alwayes, *euens by sence; the pillar and ground of fayth, the infallible teacher and mayntcyner of all necessary truth*; whence we shall in the sixt and seuenth Chapter inferre the totall ouerthrow of your cause, and shew saluation to be impossible against the Catholique Roman Church.

The second Conuiction.

9. **F**OR the totall infallibility of the Catholique Church I propose this Syllogisme out of your sayings: In matters of Religion none can be lawfull Iudges, but such as are for that office appointed of God, nor any fit for it, but such as are infallible; but the Catholike Church is lawfull Iudge endued with authority
to

to determine controuersies of Religion; *Ergo*, she is appointed of God, and made by him fit for that office, that is, infallible. In this Syllogisme, as in the former, both propositions be your owne; the *Maior* you deliuer pag. 60. n. 21. *For the deciding of ciuill controuersies men may appoynt themselves a Iudge: But in matters of Religion this office may be giuen to none, but whome God hath designed for it* And pag. 59. n. 17. *In ciuill Controuersies euery best vnderstanding man is fit to be Iudge; but in matters of Religion none but he that is infallible.*

10. The *Minor* also you deliuer often, but specially in two places. Cap. 2. n. 162. explicating a Conclusion defended in Oxford the yeare 1633. *That the Church hath authority to determine Controuersies of fayth*, objected by your Aduersary; you answered: *Me thinkes so subtil a man as you are should easily apprehend a wyde difference betweene authority to do a thing, and infallibility in doing it: & againe, betweene a conditionall infallibility, and an absolute.* The former the Doctors together with the Article of, the Church of England attributeth to the Church, and I subscribe to this opinion, that is, an authority in determining Controuersies of fayth, according to plain, and euident Scripture, and vniuersall Tradition & infallibility, so long as they proceed according to this rule. As if there arise an Heretique that should call in question Christs Passion and Resurrection, the Church had authority to decide this Controuersie, and infallible direction how to do it, and to excommunicate this man, if he should persist in error. I hope you will not deny, but that Iudges haue authority to determine criminal and ciuill Controuersies; and yet I hope you will not say, that they are absolutely infallible in their determinations. *Infallible*, while they proceed according,

to law if they do so; but not *infallibly that they shall ever do so*. Thus you. Now let the Reader be Iudge, whether it be not a thiug in you both ridiculous and hatefull to be still vantiug of the subtilty of your wit, and reproaching want thereof to your Aduersarie, whereas your subtilties be grosse contradictions of your selfe, that I am euen amazed how any man could be so forgetfull and voyd of confideration. You say, there is a wyde difference betweene authority to decide matters of Religion, and Infallibility in doing it; which you proue, because Iudges haue authority to determine criminal and ciuill Controuersies, and yet are not absolutely infallible, but infallible only conditionally if they proceed according to law. Now this your subtilty your selfe condemnes for ignorant folly, as not considering the wide difference betwixt Iudges in ciuill Controuersies, and Iudges with authority to determine matters of fayth: that the former may be fallible, but not the later. Be not these your very wordes *pag. 59. lin. vlt. and pag. 60. lin. 1. In ciuill Controuersies euery honest understanding man is fit to be a Iudge, but in Religion none but he that is infallible*. How then do you now distinguish betwixt a Iudge, and an infallible Iudge in matters of Religion?

11. Your other distinction also of Infallibility absolute and conditionall, is a meere fopperie as you declare it: and by attributing only conditionall infallibility to the Church, you contradict your selfe. For you say, *in ciuill Controuersies euery honest understanding man is fit to be iudge, but in Religion none but he that is infallible*: heere you attribute greater infallibility to the Church or Ecclesiasticall Iudge, then to a Iudge in ciuill causes; But you say, a Iudge in ciuill affaires is infallible conditionally

tionally if he proceed according to law. *Ergo*, the Church is infallible absolutely, so that she can not erre in her definitions and sentences, but still proceed according to the diuine law, or sacred Scripture. Besides the Church is infallible in a higher and absoluter manner then euery priuate Christian: But euery priuate Christian is infallible conditionally, to wit, while he proceeds according to the true and vndoubted sense of Scripture: *Ergo* the Conclusion of Oxford, *The Church hath authority to determine Controuersies of fayth*, was by the *defendant Doctour* vnderstood of infallible authority, or els it was a meere mockery. Moreouer authority to determine Controuersies of fayth, must be sufficient to make the determination to be an assured stay wheron Christian fayth may securely rely, which before was not knowne to be such; otherwise there is no determination of fayth, but fayth about that point remaynes as vncertayne and vndermined as it was before. But a Iudge absolutely fallible, and only conditionally infallible, cannot determine any controuerisy infallibly, that Fayth may determine to belieue it without danger of being deceaued. Againe, you say pag. 337. n. 20. *A questionable guide for mens direction is as good as none at all:* But the Church infallible only conditionally, that is, if perchance she hit vpon the true sense of Scripture, is a guide or determiner of Controuersies *questionable*, because after such a determination, the question still remaynes vndecided, whether that be the true sense of Scripture. Adde heereunto that Protestants do not attribute so much as this conditionall infallibility to the Church, that her determinations are infallible when they are according to plaine and euident Scripture. For they will not belieue Transubstantiation, though
R they

Morton
of the
Sacra-
ment. lib.
2. initio.

they grant, that the *Lateran* Councell defining it, proceeded according to the *plaine and euident* sense of Scripture. If, sayth D. Morton *the words of Christ*, This is my Body, be certainly true in the proper & *litterall* sense, we must yield to Papists the whole cause, Transubstantiation, corporall, and materiall Presence &c So that the Church is not infallible with Protestants, if she proceed according to the plaine, proper, and litterall sense of Scripture, but only when she hits on those figuratiue, tropicall, improper senses they fancy to themselves. And I pray you, giue me a reason, why the Catholike Church may not condemne you, for expounding figuratiuely, symbolically, tropically the text of Scripture deliuering *Transubstantiation*, according to the playne proper and litterall sense; as well as she may condemne any Heretique, that should expound the places of Scripture about our Lords Passion, and Resurrection figuratiuely against the plaine, proper, and litterall sense? Finally, whereas you say the Church is to determine Controuerfies, not only by the rule of plaine Scripture, but also of vniuersall Tradition, you say a truth against the whole drift of your booke, that the Bible is the only rule; and against what you write Cap. 2. n. 155. *nothing but Scripture comes to vs with a full streame of Tradition, and so besides Scripture there is no vnderwritten doctrine.*

12. A third place yet more cleere for the Churches totall infallibility you haue cap. 2. n. 77. where you grant the Church to be the pillar and ground of truth by office. Our Sauiour sayd to his disciples, yee are the salt of the earth, not that this quality was inseparable from their persons, but because it was their office to be so. For if they must haue been so of necessity, in vaine had he put them in feare of that which followes, If the salt haue lost his fauour, wherewith shall
it

it be salted? So the Church may be by duty the pillar & ground of Truth, of all truth not onely necessary, but also profitable to Saluation; and yet she may neglect and violate this duty, and be in fact the teacher of some error? Thus you giue vs euery where *sal infatuatum*, infatuated salt, salt vnfa- uoury. You often set good salt on the table, but instatly you corrupt it, and the good season and reason thereof, by senselesse contradictions, That the Church is by of- fice the rocke and pillar of all truth in matter of fayth, is good salt, hath the fauour and sense of diuine infallible truth; but that which followes, that she may fayle in this office, violate this duty, is senselesse, and spoken without any salt. Do not you say, that in Religion none is fit to be Iudge, that is fit for the office of iudge, but he that is infallible? How then can the Iudge in matters of Religion, endued with power to determine Contro- uersies of fayth, violate his duty, except you can con- ceauie that he that is infallible may fayle? In lyke man- ner that the Church is by office, by duty, appointed of God to be the pillar and rocke of all truth both necessary and pro- fitable to saluation, is salt, doctrine of heavenly fauour, and wisdom worthy of God: But what you presently add, that in fact she may be the teacher of error, is extremely sottrish. For if the Church be a sure and firme foundatiō of Fayth, how can she be fallible and subiect to error? Do not you say pag. 143. n. 36. lin. 11. *An authority subiect to error can be not firme or stable foundation of my be- liefe in any thing?* What is this, but that a fallible Church in something, and which *de facto* teacheth errors, cannot haue the office of pillar and ground of any truth, much lesse of all truth? How often doe you teach that God cannot command vs to doe things impossible, or com- mand vs to be, what is not in our power to be? Should

God command you to be immortall, were not that command vniust? For you being by nature mortall according to the body, and not able to shake that corruption of; how can you be immortall except God take away mortality, and bestow the gift of immortality on you? Can God appoint, that glasse be in office as strong and hard as marble, or that sand be as firme and stable as a rocke without taking brittlenes from the one and vnstedfastnes from the other? I conclude with this syllogisme wherein both Propositions being your owne, you cannot deny the Conclusion. God hath appointed the Church to be by office the *pillar and ground of all Christian truth*, a firme and stable Foundation of fayth in all matters of saluation: But a Church subiect to error cannot be a pillar, ground, or foundation of Christian beleefe in any thing: *Ergo*, the Church is an infallible teacher of all truth, an infallible guide in fundamentals, and consequently in all her proposals.

That



That Protesters against the Church of Rome, be
Schismatiques and Heretiques, and cannot
be saved without actuall dereliction of
their errors.

CHAP. VI.

T SAID in the title *Protesters*, not *Pro-*
testants: for though with you, *Pro-*
testants and *Protesters* be the same,
yet it is not so according to the
acception of the word *Protestant*
commonly receaved in England.
You define Protestants to be such as *Protest* against the
corruptions and abuses of the Church of Rome, all of them
agreeing in this principle, *that the Bible, the Bible, and on-* Cap. 2. n.
ly the Bible is a perfect rule of fayth and action. So that all 2.
pretended Gospellers and reformed Churches, all that Cap. 6.
infinite diuersity of sects, which agree amongst themselves n. 56.
as King James sayth, in nothing but in union against the
Pope; Calvinists, Lutherans, Brownists Anabaptists, refer- Against
med Eutychiās, Arians, Sabellians, Samosatēnians or Socinians Vorstin
Tritheists, and others innumerable are by you com- pag. 65.
prehended vnder the name of Protestants, whome you
maintayne to be free from damnable error, and in a
safe way to Saluation. Preface

R. 3

2. But

n. 39.

2. But in *England* (as all men know) by the name of *Protestants* we properly vnderstand, that part of the pretended *English Reformation*, which is condisinct from *Puritans*, and opposite against them. Hence *Protestants* with vs be not the whole multitude of *Protesting Biblists*, or of the pretended reformed Churches, but, only one branch of them, the most moderate of all, & that which doth least exorbitate from the *Doctrine and Discipline* of the *Roman Church*. Wherefore by *Protesters* in this discourse, we shall alwayes vnderstand them, & euery one of them, that oppose and *Protest* against any doctrine proposed as *matter of fayth* by the *Catholique Roman Church*, of what *Seet* or *Religion* soeuer they be; and that these cannot be saued by *ignorance*, or by *repentance*, without actuall detestation and abandoning of their errours in particular.

3. For though they ignorantly iudge, that they haue the truth on their side, yet this ignorance doth not excuse their erring, because it is not simple ignorance, but such ignorance as is euer essentially inuolued and contayned in the crime of *Heresy*, to wit, the ignorance of *Pride* and *Presumption*; ignorance whereby they preferre the seeming of their fancy or iudgmēt before *Traditions*, *Councells*, consent of *Fathers*, *miracles*, the plain proper and literall sense of *Scripture* which stand for the *Roman Church* and *Religion*; These I say, cannot be saued in their errours, but are *Schismatiques* and *Heretiques*, as I shall cleerely demonstrate in this Chapter, euen by your owne sayings and Principles, and first,

That they are Schismatiques.

4. To proue this we must briefly declare what *Schisme* is. The word *Schisme* comes originally from

exioma, which signifies any diuision, cutting, breaking, renting away of any part from an entire & whole thing, as a bough from a tree, a stone from a building, any member from mans body. By Metaphor the word is applyed to signify breaches and diuisions in any morall Body, which is of two kindes, *Politically* and *Mystically*. In *Politically* Bodies, or *Temporall States*, *Schisme* happeneth when any part of the States departeth from the Communion and fellowship of others in being subiect to the supreme authority which ruleth, gouerneth, knitteth and keepeth the whole together, whether this authority be *Monarchicall*, *Aristocraticall*, or *Democraticall*. *Mystically* whole Bodies be only one, the holy Catholique Church, the *Body of Christ*, of which to be a member, as it is the sole and only state of Saluation, so to be deuided from it is sinfull and damnable. *Schisme* then in this sense may be defined. *A voluntary choyce whereby a Christian doth deuide, and cut away himselfe from the Communion and fellowship of other Christians, in the common knot of subiection & subordination vnto the supreme Head and Authority of this Body*: I say *voluntary choyce*, for no man can be made a *Schismaticke* against his will, *Schisme* being a sinne and a most grieuous sinne. Euery *Schismaticke* then deuideth himselfe from the Church by his *voluntary choyce*; either *direct*, as when one doth in plaine termes refuse, and detest subiection to the common Head and Pastour of the Church; or *indirect* when he standeth peremptory against the Church, either *obstinately* against her *Doctrines*, or *contumaciously* against her *Commandes*. For such an one is *hoc ipso* cut of, and cast away out of the Church in the sight of God, and the sentence of the Church doth declare him to be such an one, and makes him knowne for such an one,

one, to them of the Church. This supposed I come to prooue, that they who separate or oppose against the Church of *Rome* are Schismatiques.

The first Conuiction.

5. **Y**OU say Cap. 5. n. 36. initio. For men to forsake the external Communion of them with whom they agree in fayth, is the most formal & proper crime of schisme: very true. Thus you. But Protestants agree with the visible vniuersal Church in all fundamental points of fayth (as you pretend) and yet they haue forsaken her externall Communion. For cap. 5. n. 52. initio. you speake thus to your aduersary: Whereas you say, that Protestants diuided themselves from the externall Communion of the visible Church; adde, which externall communion was corrupted, and we shall confesse the accusation, and glory in it. And cap. 5. n. 55. As for the externall Communion of the visible Church, we haue without scruple formerly granted, that Protestants did forsake it. Ergo, it is very true, that Protestants in separating from the Church of *Rome* did commit the proper and formall crime of Schisme.

6. This Syllogisme doth consist of propositions which are formally & verbally yours, yet because you falter and halt in the assertion of them contradicting your selfe, to make this demonstration conuincing, I will proue both the Premises cleerely by such truths as you are forced to acknowledge. The maior Proposition, that it is formall Schisme to forsake the visible Church, or her externall Communion, which you grant in the words I cited, you deny cap. 5. n. 5. lin. 3. in these words to your aduersary: Whereas you take for granted as an undoubted truth, that whosoever leaue the externall Communion of the visible Church, are Schismaticall, I tell you, Sir, you presume

to much upon vs, and would haue vs grant, that which is the maine point in question. Behold now that is false, which before you sayd was very true; Which also to be absolutely true, I proue by what you write *cap. 5. n. 45 lin. 16.* A man may possibly leaue some opinion or practise of a Church formerly common to himselfe, and others, and continue still a member of that Church: Prouided, that what he forsakes be not one of those things wherein the essence of the Church doth consist. And c. 3. n. 66. lin. 9 You may not cease to be of the Church, nor depart from those things which make it so to be. This you. Now I subsume: but externall Communion, that is, externall Society, fellowship, and vnity of the members of the Church, in their subordination to the common Head, and supreme external Authority thereof, is one of the things wherein the essence of the Church doth consist, one of the things which make it to be a Church. This is cleere, because as it is of the essence of an human organically Body, not only to haue a multitude of members locally layd together in one heape; but also that they be knit and compacted together in the vnity of one Body by ioint subordination to the head: so it is of the essence of euery morall or mysticall body, not only to haue a multitude of members or persons, but also that the persons, members and subiects be knit together, and vnited in the Society of one Communion, that is, of one common vnion of subordination to the Head.

7. And this Communion or common subiection must in the members of the Church be *external and visible*: because it is of the essence of the Church to be an externall and visible Society or Body; which is proued, because you say *Cap. 3. n. 78. That it is of the essence of the Church to be the rocke and pillar, that is, still in fact a proposer*

poser, maintainer, and teacher of all necessary truth. But it is of the essentiall necessity of a teaching Church, to be visible and externall, as you suppose Cap. 3. n. 39. lin. 23. A Church that were invisible, so that none could repaire to it for direction, could not be an infallible guide, that is a teacher of truth, yet it might be in it self infallible. Wherefore external Communion, or common Vnion of the members of the Church in their subiection to one common Head, or visible supreme governing Authority, is of the essence of the Church; it is one of the things which make the Church a Church. But Protesters forsooke the externall Communion, the common Vnion & knot with their fellow-members in the vnity of subiection to one visible governing Church-Authority, and made to themselves new Conuenticles, and Churches vnder new Gouvernours, and formes of gouernment, as is notorious. It is therefore manifest, that they forsaking the externall Communion of the visible Church (because in their iudgment corrupted) forsooke the Church of God in one of the things wherein the essence of the Church doth consist; in one of the things which make the Church a Church; and consequently are Schismatiques.

The second Conuiction.

8. **I**T is, you say, of the essence of the Church of Christ to be by office the pillar and ground, that is, the teacher of truth, & of all truth, & alwayes in fact the teacher and guide of men in all truth necessary to Saluation. Consequently it is of the essence of the Church to be able to performe this office, and to be still in act a Director of men to heauen But you say Pag. 163. lin. 6. That Church alone can performe the office of Guide or Director, which is of one denomination, that is, a settled certain Society

Cap. 3. n.
72.

Society of Christians, distinguishable from all others by adhering to such a Bishop for their guide in Fundamentalls. Ergo, it is of the essence of the visible Catholique Church of Christ to be of one denomination, adhering to one common Bishop, as to their guide in Fundamentalls. This supposed: that Protestants be seuered from the way of Salvation, Schismaticques & aliens from the only Church that can be the guide to heauen, I shall not need to proue; you grant it (a) Pag. 264. lin. 4. Put case I should (2) Cap. grant of meere fauour, that there must be alwaies some Church s. n. 27. of one denomination, free from all errors in Doctrine, and that ^{versus} Protestants had not alwaies such a Church; it would indeed ^{sinon.} follow, that I must not be a Protestant; but that I must be a Papist, certainly it would follow by no better consequence then this: If you will leaue England, you must of necessity goe to Rome. Thus you. From which saying I argue. If there must be alwaies some Church of one denomination, free from all errors in doctrine, subiect to one visible head and guide: then you must not be a Protestant if you will be saued, that is, then Protestants be not a true Church, but a Company that hath forsaken the true Church, and cannot be saued if they continue where they are. But that there alwaies was, & alwaies must be such a Church of Christ, such a Society of Christians, which is the ground and rocke of all truth, settled and certaine, and of one denomination, was in the precedent Chapter not by you granted of meere fauour, but extorted from you by the euidence of truth, & vndeniable texts of Scripture. Ergo, Protestants are Schismaticques, & separated from the Church, the rocke and ground of fayth; and cannot be saued except they remoue to the one Church & be built thereupon by dependance on the Rocke, by subordination to the Head thereof. Now, if there must

be such a Catholique Church of one denomination, whether the *Roman* be that Church, and not rather the *Gracian* or *Abissine*, is in the iudgment euen of Protestants I dare say, a ridiculous doubt and a fond fancy: but more hereof in the next Chapter.

The third Conuiction.

9. **Y**OU are conuicted of proper and formall Schisme, by the Confutation of your excuses, whereby you would cleere your reuolt from so heynous a crime, which you set downe *Cap. 5. nu. 36.* *I would faine know wherein, I may not without Schisme, forsake the externall Communion of them, with whome I agree in fayth: whether I be bound, for feare of Schisme, to communicate with those that belieue as I do, only in lawfull thinges, or absolutely in euery thing, whether I am to ioyne with them in superstition, and Idolatry, and not only in a common confession of fayth, wherein we agree, but in a common dissimulation or abiuration of it?* These your questions or excuses be friuolous and idle for many reasons. First, because you suppose without prooffe, that the vniuersal visible Church may be stayned with superstition & Idolatrie, which is the mayne point in question. And your supposition to be false we prooue euen by this argument: That Church cannot be stayned with superstition and Idolatry, whose external Communion or vnion of the members thereof vnder one head, cannot be forsaken without the most proper and *formall crime of Schisme*. But to forsake the externall Communion of the visible Church, you confesse to be the most formall crime of Schisme. *Ergo*, the external Communion of the visible Church cannot be stayned vniuersally with superstition and Idolatrie.

10. Secondly, your questions are vaine, because they imply contradiction & destroy ech other. For how can it consist together, that you do agree in fayth with the Church in fundamentals, and that yet she teach Idolatry, and vrge you to abiure with her the fayth wherein you, & she both agree? Thirdly, if the Church be supposed to be stayned with vniuersall error and Idolatry, it doth indeed follow, that you must not communicate with her in Idolatry, but not that you may forsake the external common Vnion of all the members thereof to the Head and vniuersall Authority, which ioyneth them together in one Society of a Christian Church: But Protestants forlooke the vnity of their follow-members, refusing to communicate with them, not onely in superstition, but also in the vnity of subiection to the Head-authority of the whole body. They did deuide themselves from that Body, erecting to themselves new Conuenticlss, new Churches, vnder new chosen heades, guides, & pastours. *Ergo*, they cannot be excused from the formall and proper crime of Schisme and Rebellion against the Church.

11. You will say: had they not forsaken that vnity of subiection to the common head, they must haue professed Idolatry, or else haue beene burnt: I answere if the supposition be true of *Idolatry* in the Church, they had byn blessed Martyrs in choosng rather to dye, then eyther to commit Idolatry, or deuide the Church: But because they did not so, but sought to deuide the Church, to saue their lyues, they be now damned Schismatiques. For will you dare to say, that men may commit the most formall crime of Schisme and rebellion against the Church,, rather then be put to death? Then if a Prince persecute men for Religion, they may rebell

and deuide his Kingdome if they be able, rather then
aye for their Religion.

12. You say *Cap. 5. n. 55. in fine. No man can haue cause
to be a Schismaque.* I assume, But to forsake the externall
vnity of Gods Church, or the fellowship of subordina-
tion to the head-authority of the whole Body is to be a
most formall and proper Schismaticque. *Ergo*, No feare
of being eyther stayned with superstitiō or put to death
could iustifie your relinquishing the externall Commu-
nion, or vnion with Gods Church, nor your erecting of
new Conuenticles vnder new Superiours from being
formall and proper Schisme.

(a) pag. 156. lin. 30. 13. Moreouer you say, that in the dayes of *S. Austin*
there (a) was vniuersall superstition in the Church; that (b)
all places were full of superstitions, humane presumptions,
(b) pag. 155. lin. 21. vayne worships, which were (c) urged vpon others with great
violence, & the streame of them was growne (d) so stronge that
Second Edit. c. 3. *S. Austin* durst not oppose it. And yet *S. Austin* did not
n. 47. therefore forsake the Church, and his subordination to
pag. 149. the Pastours thereof: nay he doth euery where most
150. earnestly and seuerely, & (as you confesse) iustly rebuke,
(c) pag. 156. lin. 36. and conuince the *Donatists* of damnable sinne for deu-
iding the Church, and erecting new Conuenticles,
(d) pag. 156 lin. 24. Altars, Churches vnder new Pastours. It is manifest
therefore euen by your owne Principles and Professi-
ons, that Protesters cannot be excused from damnable
Schisme, though the visible Church had beene (as in *S.*
Austins tyme you make it) so, when *Luther* reuolted,
full of superstitions, human presumptions, and vaine
worships: which yet to haue byn, or to be in the Church,
you neither do, nor can prooue, otherwyse then by
your bare word, which I hope is no rule of Fayth, more
then *S. Cyprians*, which being objected to you, you reiect
saying

(e) saying angerly to your Aduersary : *Why in a contro- (e) Cap.*
uersy of sayth do you cite any thing which is confessed on all 3. 43. 48.
bands, not to be a rule of sayth?

The fourth Conuiction.

14.

VE proceed to conuince Protesters of
 Schisme, euen though your most false
 suppositions were true. Let vs suppose ineuitable ne-
 cessity to haue beene vrgent vpon them (as you say it
 was) eyther to abandon the vnity of subordination to *Cap. 5. n.*
 Gods Church, or else against their conscience to pro- *72.*
 fesse her errours ; I say they should in that case rather
 haue vndergone this hypocriticall dissimulation, then
 that Schismaticall separation. This I proue, because
 though that be true, which S. Paul teaches, *That euill is*
not to done, that good may follow ; yet that is false which
 you affirme. *pag. 283. n. 72. We must not do euill to auoyd euil.*
 This is against the knowne Principle of reason *that of (f) Cap.*
two Euills we are to choose the lesse, when we cannot auoid 3 n. 10.
 both, because a lesser Euill, *considered as necessary to auoyd* *What*
a greater, is endued with the quality of goodnesse, and is *else do*
not so much euill as good. But to professe against ones *we vn-*
 conscience an errorr small & vnfundamentall (f) *which* *derstand*
doth not ouerthrow Salvation, where with one may be saued, *by an*
 is a lesse euill then separation from the vnity of Gods *vnfun-*
 Church, & from subordination to the authority there *damen-*
 of, for this is most formall and proper Schisme. Hence *talier-*
 it is false (what you with (g) D. Potter so much auerre, *rouer, but*
 and lay as the fundamentall stone of your building) *such a*
 that it is damnable sinne to professe any the least veni- *one with*
 all errorr against ones conscience, and that it were bet *which a*
 ter to depart from the Church and erect new Conuen- *man*
 ticles, as Protesters did, then hypocritically to professe, *may be*
 (h) *saued.*
 (g) *D. Potter*
 pag 77.

(h) Cap.
5. n. 59.
versus
finem.

(h) that there be *no Antipodes*, should the Church enforce you eyther to professe there be none, or else forsake her Communion. This is a false and pernicious principle, and (as I sayd) agaynst the light of reason and common notion written in the hearts of all men, *that of two Evils we are to choose the lesse*, if of necessity we must do the one, or the other. The light of the truth seene of euery man was not hidden from you, when you were not blinded with actual reflexion, that by the light thereof your separation from the Church is shewed euidently to be Schismaticall. For Cap. 4. n. 18. *in fine*, you say, *I willingly confesse, the iudgement of a Councell though not infallible, is yet so farre directive and obliging, that without apparent reason to the contrary it may be sinne to reiect it, at least not to afford it OUTWARD submission for publique peace sake*. Now what is outward submission to definitions which you do not receave in your heart, but outward Profession to believe what in your conscience you thinke to be false? If it be lawfull, and men may be bound vnder sinne, to professe *outward submission* vnto what they iudge erroneous, for publique peace-sake, that is, for the auoyding of Schisme; who doth not see, that the doctrine whereon the iustification of your revolt from the Catholique Church resteth to be false, to wit, that it is always impious and damnable to professe *outward submission* to any the least error, which in conscience you thinke to be error.

The fifth Conuiction.

15. **T**O forsake the visible Church without any cause, vpon a meere fancy, is damnable sinne: This you affirme a thousand tymes in your fifth Chapter. But Protestants abandoned the Church of
Rome

Rome without any iust cause: this you allow and iustify seeking to answere the obiection, *How may a Protestant, who is at least as fallible as the Church, be sure that the Church erreth, and that he hath hitt on the truth, that he may with a good conscience forsake her Communion?* you say cap. 5. n. 63. in fine. He may be sure, because he may see the doctrine forsaken by him to be repugnant to Scripture, and the doctrine imbraced by him consonant to it; AT LEAST this he may knowe, that the doctrine which he hath CHOSEN, to him SEEMES TRUE, and the contrary which he hath forsaken SEEMES FALSE. And therefore without REMORSE of Conscience he may professe that, but this he cannot. O how true is the Prouerbe, What aboundeth in the heart will out at the mouth, yea out of the quill, which is ruled by an vnconsidering Writer. You harbour in your heart that Socinian impiety, that men may be saued in any Religion; but you would fayne hide it, and therefore make great shew (h) to abhorre it, as most impious and execrable doctrine by foule calumny imputed vnto you. And yet in this passage you do cleerely professe it, and so fully, that irreligion it selfe could not do more, saying absolutely without any limitation: That if a man know, that a doctrine to him seemeth false, he may without remorse forsake it and the Church which teacheth it, and go to another Society which teacheth the contrary: so that if a man know, that to him Christianity seemeth false, and Iudaisme or Turcisme true, though he haue no certaine ground so to thinke, he may without scruple, without remorse of conscience, leaue Christianity, and become a Iew or Turke. Puritans, Brownists, Anabaptists, Arians, Socinians, Tritheists know, that to them the Religion of the Church of England seemeth false, and the contrary which destroyes Christianity true; may they

T

with

(h) Pag.
392. fine
2. Edit.
Pag. 373.
lin. 26.

with a good conscience without scruple or remorse leaue the Church of *England*, and ioine themselves to their most impure, Familiar Cōuenticles & Churches?

16. When the *Maintayner* of *Charity* layes some testimonies of Fathers in your way, you fall a singing, *In noua fert animus* — (i) telling him, that the Fathers be not *the rule of your Faith*, & that their testimonies be no more pertinent thē that semi-verse. Verily you could not haue found a ditty more proper and fitting the tune of your soule so fertile and full of nouelties. Nor is there any man lyuing I know, that can better then your selfe out of his owne experience — *mutatas dicere formas*. What you haue done your selfe you allow vnto others, that by your principles they may change Religions as they do their linnen, and forge new formes of fayth as often as they make new suites of apparell. Being questioned about the ground of their change, they may answer *In noua fert animus* — I know that this nouel choyce to me seemeth good, and that the doctrine of the Church of *England* to me seemeth false, & *M. Chillingworths* booke, which goes for current in *England*, assureth me, that this alone without further assurance sufficeth, that without *remorse of conscience* I may forsake her, and goe to some other Congregation in the world which pleaseth me better, and whose Religion I know to me seemeth true.

The sixth Conuiction.

17. Contradicting the leuity of your former assertion, that a man though he do not euidently know his cause to be iust may forsake the Church; if at least he know that her doctrine to him seemeth false, you write very grauely & soberly to the contrary, saying

saying Cap. 5. n. 53. initio. It concernes EVERY MAN who separates from any Churches communion, even as much as his salvation is worth, to looke most carefully to it, that the cause of his separation be iust and necessary: for vnlesse it be necessary it can hardly be sufficient. Vnder the wings of this most true proposition I shroud this assumption to be made good by your principles. But Protesters had no iust or sufficient cause to rent themselues from the Roman and visible Catholique Church. This I proue, for their pretence is, they were forced and necessitated to do so by the euidence of Scripture, which in formall and expresse termes ^{Cap. 5. n. 107. lin 3.} contaynes many of their opinions, and is against the Roman Catholique Religion as cleere as the light at noon. But this to ^{Cap. 3. n. 6.} be false, and that you and they herein speake against your consciences may be made as cleere as the Sunne euen by your owne principles.

18. For pag. 156. n. 9. you say, In all controuersies where there is is a seeming conflict of Scripture with Scripture, Reason with Reason, Authority with Authority; how this can consist with the manifest reuealing of the truth of cyther side I cannot well understand. Now it is as manifest as the Sunne, that in all controuersies betwixt Protesters and the Church of Rome, there is a seeming conflict of Scripture with Scripture, of Reason with Reason, of Authority with Authority: yea in many controuersies the Scripture is cleere on our side taken according to the playne and euident sense of the text; that Protesters are forced lyke Proteus to turne themselues into all manner of figures, & hide themselues with a figuratiue sense, that they be not takē in manifest & confessed vnbelieve of Gods word.

19. This may be confirmed by the examples you bring in this your booke, to shew that in some points the Scripture is cleere against the Church of Rome, to

wit against the *worship of Angels, Communion in one kind, Latin service, an infallible Iudge*; for in this maine decre-
tory battaile for the whole, it may be well supposed you
would produce your best souldiers, and vse your stron-
gest weapons: yea to take away all doubt of the matter,
you professe, that they are the cleereſt you haue, nay
that there cannot *poſſibly be any plainer*. Theſe inſtances
by you often repeated, which are the ſubſtance & pith
of your Booke, I wil prooue to be weake, vaine, impro-
bable, incredible, euen by your owne principles.

20. Firſt then, *Preface* x. 11. *lin.* 18. How (ſay you) is it
poſſible any thing ſhould be playner forbidden then the wor-
ſhip of Angels in the Epistle to the Colossians? Thus you,
without prooffe. Againſt whome I reply, that the place
is darke, obſcure, doubtfull, ambiguous, as none can
poſſibly be more; which I prooue. Firſt it is ambiguous
and questionable in reſpect of the tranſlation, or rather
without queſtion it is falſified by you (a) *Pag.* 52. *lin.*
26. where ſpeaking to vs you ſay: *Do not impoſe vpon men*
that humility of worſhipping Angels which S. Paul condemnes.
The true text is: *Nemo vos ſeducat volens in humilitate &*
religione Angelorum: let no man beguile you of your reward
in voluntary humility and religion of Angels. Hence appea-
reth, that your chāging, corrupting, peruertering of holy
Scripture in this place is as great as any could poſſibly
be vſed vpon a text of ſo few words. You turne the
particle *and*, into *of*, *θεοσεβεία* which ſignifies Religion
or diuine and Religious worſhip due to God only, not
ſo much the act as the forme, you tranſlate ſimply wor-
ſhipping. *Angelorum* being the Genitiue caſe, of the An-
gels, you make it the Accuſatiue, *the humility of worſhip-*
ping Angels, as if the Latin text had byn *in humilitate co-*
lendi Angelos. And this alone were ſufficient to prooue
the

(a) *Cap.*
2. nu. 1.
verſus
ſinem.

the place impertinent, because the Apostle doth not reprove any kind of worship of Angels but only *ερεσκων*, (a) the worshipping them Religiously as Gods, offering sacrifice to them.

21. Secondly the text lyes open vnto ambiguity of senses in regard of the particule *of*, which may referre Religious worship to Angels as to the *objects* thereof, *the Religion of Angels*, that is, the Religion wherewith Angels are worshipped; or else, to Angels, as the Authors thereof, the Religion of Angels, that is, the Religion which was deliuered vnto men and reuealed by Angels. Heereupon ariseth a question indecidable, in which sense *S. Paul* intended to speake. Many, as euen *Caluin* (b) granteth, vnderstand not Religious worship offered vnto Angels, *sed cultum ab Angelis traditum*, the forme of diuine worship deliuered by the Angels: such was the Religion of the Iewes by Angels (c) deliuered vnto *Moses*, which exposition *Caluin* doth not dislike.

22. Thirdly the word *Angels* is much more ambiguous, there being two kinds of Angels some good some bad, and in ech kind there is a great variety of offices and degrees, and consequently great diuersitie of opinions amongst Fathers and Expositours, which kind of Angels are meant, as you may see in *Iustinianus* and *Cornelius*. Amongst the which opinions the most probable is, that by Religion of Angels in this place, the *Magicall* (d) adoration of diuels, or bad Angels is vnderstood, taught by *Simon Magus*. Now this being proued we will intreate you to call to mynd what you write *Cap. 2. n. 104. lin. 8. When a place by reason of ambiguous termes lyes indifferent beewene diuers senses, whereof the one is true and the other false, to say, that God vnder paine*

Thres-
kia à
Traci-
bus est
religiosè
sacrifi-
cijs &
orgijs
colere.
Gregor.
Nazian.
(b) Cal-
uin Com-
ment in
hunc lo-
cum.
(c) Alij
Religio-
nem An-
gelorum
intelli-
gunt
Religio-
nem Iu-
daicam,
qua data
est Moy-
si per
Ange-
los. Cor-
nel.
(d) Ad
magi-
cam il-
lam su-
persti-
tionem à
Simone

institu-
tam,
Paulum
respe-
xisse
haud
ambigā.
Iustitia-
nus.

of damnation obligeth men not to mistake, is to make God a Tyrant. Now where is your text as cleere as the sunne? Is it not now as darke as night, to shew the worship of Angels vsed by the Catholique Church vnlawful? May not I with good reason giue you warning in the words of our Lord, *Si lumen quod in te est tenebrae sunt, tenebrae tuae quanta erunt?* If your text, then which none can possibly be cleerer, is so darke; how darke are your other texts, which euen in your owne sight seeme not so cleere?

(d) Gen.
18. by A-
braham.

Gen. 19.

by Lot.

Num. 22.

by Baala

1of. 5. by

Iosue.

(f) Gen.

48. 16.

Angelus

qui eruit

me.

23: On the other side, the text wherein the Saints of God (d) adored holy Angels prostrate on the ground, yea inuocated Angels, as (f) Iacob, *The Angell that deliuered me from all euill blesse these two children.* These texts I say are cleere as none can be cleerer: And Protestants not to be scorched with the heauenly heate of reuerend & feruent Deuotion towards the blessed Angels, which might be kindled in their hearts by the lightsome influence of Gods word, pretend ouer the litterall euidence a mysticall or rather misty veyle or cloath of their text-obscuring interpretations, painted with vnseemely figures of improper sense.

Cap. 3. n.

71.

24. Now for Communion in both kinds, *Who* (say you) *can deny, but they are taught it by our Sauour Ioan. 6. in these words according to most of their owne expositions. Vnlesse you eat the flesh of the sonne of man, and drinke his bloud you haue not life in you.* Thus you, in which speach your wordes interfere, gallech others ankles, destroy themselves: for to say, *Who can deny according to the exposition of most Catholiques, that this text is understood of Sacramental eating and drinking*, doth imply that many Catholiques, and with them most of Protestants deny it. And consequently, *Who can deny it according to most*, is as wise

wise a speech, as if you should say, It is a most vndenia-
ble, by many iustly denied, truth. For do not you write,
*Preface n. 30. in fine. There is no more certaine signe, that a
Point is not euident, then that honest, and understanding, and
indifferent men, and such as giue themselves liberty of Iudg-
ment after a mature deliberation, differ about it?*

25. Thirdly you vrge Scripture as plaine against La-
tin seruice saying *Cap. 3. n. 21. & n. 71. It is a plaine reue-
lation of God, that the publique Prayers and Hymnes of the
Church should be in such a language as is most for edification:*
yet these reuelatiōs the Church of Rome not seeing &c. I omit
that you corrupt the Scripture, by adding to the text
the word *most*. And *pag. 173. lin. 3.* you cite these as the
very words of S. Paul, *to vse a language which the Assistants
generally vnderstand not is not for edificatiō,* which is Scrip-
ture verbatim coyned and forged in your owne head. I
pretermit also so many cleere and fully satisfying an-
sweres giuen by Catholiques which you do not mentiō
much lesse confute: I will shew that you behead this
your Argumēt with your owne sword. Do not you say
*Cap. 3. n. 32. that the Apostles in their writings deliuer some
things as the dictates of human reason and prudence, and not
as diuine reuelations, and that you see no reason why we should
take them to be diuine reuelations?* This supposed, I assume:
But S. Paul deliuers this order, that an vnknowne ton-
gue is not best for edification and decency, as a dictate
of humane reason and prudence, as is manifest by the
whole tenour of his discourse: *Ergo*, there is no reason
why we should take it as a diuine reuelation vpon your
word? We belieue it indeed as the word of God, that
the Apostle did iudge that obseruance most for edifica-
tion and decency in those tymes, when Latin & Greeke
were vulgar languages almost euery where commonly
knowne

knowne of all. Since his tyme the Latin being not knowne and vulgar in euery Country of the Latin Church as it was before, whether in this respect the Latin ought to cease, to be the Vniuersall language for the Liturgy of the Latin Church, is a question not decided by diuine reuelation, but to be decided by human reason and prudence; for it is different in state and quality from that decided by the Apostle: such kind of dictats of human reason being variable according to the diuersity of tymes, places, persons, customes. Adde that Latin which most men of better education and quality vnderstand, and all Church-men vnderstand, cannot be tearmed a language vnkowne in the Church, yea rather vulgar tongues are vnkowne and barbarous in the Christian Church.

(g) Cap. 4. n. 16. lin. 23. Ca. 4 n. 53 Cap. 6. n. 61. & in many other places. (h) Cap. 2. n. 155. 26. Fourthly against infallible Iudges (g) in the Church since the Apostles, you come forth euery foote with this Scripture, *Be not called Maisters vpon earth, for one is your Maister Christ.* The vanity of which obiection I demonstrate by this Syllogisme wherein both propositions be your owne, and most infallible truths: *The Apostles (h) were the infallible Iudges of Controuersies about faith so long as they lyued, the Maisters, Doctours, Guides of the Church.* But the Apostles heerein did not transgresse the command giuen them by our Lord, *be not called Maisters on earth.* Ergo, to be, and to be called Iudges, and Maisters of the Church in the place of Christ, and subordinate vnto him, is not against that precept of our Lord.

27. I conclude this Argument, requesting you in the sight of the Inspectour of hearts (as you belieue there is any such) to ruminare and ponder your owne saying: *It imports euery man who separates from any Churches Communion, euen as much as his Saluation is worth, to looke*

most carefully that the case of his separation be iust and necessary. The cause pretended of your separation from the Communion of the whole Catholique Church, is the euidence of Scripture against her custome. The strongest testimonies you do, or can pretend are these by me now answered, then which, you say, there cannot possibly be any playner. Now can you thinke in conscience, that the former testimonies are cleere, euident, necessary, such as necessitate, conuince, and compell the vnderstanding to assent? Can you presume you shall be so eloquent at the day of Iudgement, as to make our Lord believe you were so simple and of so little Iudgement, as you did really, and in conscience vndoubtedly believe, that these texts were euident, necessary, formall, expresse, as cleere as the Sunne? Thinke of it I pray you, for by your owne confession, it concerns you and euery Protestant, as much as his eternall saluation is worth.

The seauenth Conuiction.

27. **Y**OU forsake the Roman and the Catholique external Communion, not onely without iust cause, but without as much as a seeming cause, euen against your conscience out of hatred of knowne truth: What is damnable Schisme if this be not? that you goe against your conscience and impugne knowne truth, though you be very loath this myltery of your heart should be disclosed, yet such is your inconsideration as you professe it openly inough in words, but practise the same much more openly in deeds. *cap. 2. n. 47. in fine. The rest of this Paragraph I am as willing it should be true, as you are to haue it, and so let it passe as a discourse, wherein we are wholly unconcerned. You might haue met with an Aduersary, that would not haue suffered you to haue said so*

much truth together, but to me it is sufficient, that it is nothing to the purpose. These be your words; in which you lay the inside of your heart outwards, and plainly discover your wifull auersion from knowne truth. You suffered *Charity mainteyned* to speake so much truth together: Why did you so? Not because it was truth, but because it was not to the purpose, that is, it made not against you, & so you were willing it should be true. And doth not this imply that had that part of the Paragraph made against you, had you beene vnwilling it should haue beene true, you would not haue endured it, you would haue impugned it with all might and mayne, though it had beene *truth neuer so much*? Had you sayd, *You might haue met with an Aduersary that would not haue suffered you to haue sayd so much vntruth together, but to mee it is sufficient that it is nothing to the purpose;* this had been some courtesy of forbearāce: but to say, that you would not suffer so much truth to be sayd together, but that it made not against you, this is Charity with all my heart. You will suffer vs to speake truth if you are willing it should be truth; a great fauour. But if you hate that truth we speake, because it presseth your pride, which will not let you stoope to submit your wit to the word of God proposed by his Church: you will rage & storme against it, deny it, impugne it, seeke to darken the light thereof, to make the same hatefull by vttering any vntruth against it.

28. For example, you are not willing the Roman Church should be the true Church; therefore to hide the light of this truth you heape lyes together, and fill whole pages and leaues with rage and fury, without any the least *lucidum interuallum*. To giue the reader a little tast of your bitternes, and one draught of your
sale

salt sea; you, pag. 90. thus declaime against vs. You who *Sec. edit.*
 haue wronged so exceedingly Christ his miracles, and his do- *cap. 2. n.*
 ctine, by forging so euidently so many false miracles for the *101. pag.*
 confirmation of your new doctrine; who with forging so many *26. lin.*
 false Stories, and false Authours haue taken a fayre way to *26.*
 make the fayth of all Stories questionable; who haue brought
 in doctrines plainly and directly contrary to that which you
 confesse to be the word of Christ, which for the most part make
 for the honour and proffit of the teachers of them; who make
 profession of corrupting all sorts of Authours, whose questioned
 doctrines none of them came from the fountayne of Apostoli-
 que tradition, but haue insinuated themselues into the strea-
 mes by little and little, some in one age, some in another &c.
 and men are told they were as good belicue nothing at all, as
 not to belicue these things to haue come from the Apostles,
 which they know to haue been brought in but yesterday; whe-
 ther this be not a ready way, and likely way to make men to
 conclude with themselves, I will belicue nothing at all; and
 whether this conclusion be not to often made in Italy, and
 Spaine, and France, and England too, I leaue it to the Iudg-
 ment of those who haue wisdom and experience. Thus you.
 And is not this a good prooffe of your profession, that
 you will suffer no truth, if you be vnwilling it should
 be truth, but will load it with all manner of vnprooued
 and vnprobable falshood?

29. As for the last point of your inuectiue, whether
 there be not too many in Italy, Spaine, France, and
 England, who because they are vrged to belicue more
 then they list, thereupon conclude to belicue iust no-
 thing at all, with firme Christian fayth; you leaue it to
 be determined by men of wisdom and experience: I
 thinke euery man may resolue it by the experience
 which you will not let them want, to wit, that in En-

(a) Pag.
330 lin.
24.

gland certainly there is one such, and that is too many by one; for you hate and abhorre to believe *the revealed* (a) *manner* of Christian mysteries, which is incomprehensible to your human and carnall reason; and in this respect also hate and abhorre the Church of Rome, which will not allow Saluation without believe thereof vnto any Christian, to whome it is proposed by her preaching. Yea you do both by word and deed further professe, that you will not *suffer any truth* which crosseth this your impious fancy; though it be truth *neuer so much*, you will deny it, impugne it, disgrace it by all kind of fictions and lyes. And whereas you say, that some other answerer of your Crew would not haue been so good to the *Mainteyner of Charity*: for they would not (you say) haue suffered him to haue said so much truth together; whereas to you it is sufficient that the truth makes not to the purpose: Pardon me, Sir. I tell you plainly, I do not believe you. For why should they deny knowne truth and rage against it, if they be willing it should be truth, as not being against them? It may well be, that they may hate some knowne truth which you do not hate; and againe, you may hate some truth (as the mysterie of the B. Trinity) which they do not hate; but for malignity and wilfull opposition against knowne truth, for not enduring it, for being rebels against the light, for being in the number of them in whome S. Pauls Prophecy is verified, That, *in the later dayes there should arise many, who would not SVFFER or enaure wholesome doctrine, but turne away their hearing from truth, to the belicuing and venting of fables, tales, lyes, yillanous slaunders*: In this respect (I say) they cannot be worse then you are, as appeareth by your profession & practise set downe in this argument; from which we will

will passe to the next, wherein you assure *Protesters* of their Saluation, notwithstanding their liuing and dying in these kind of direfull passions and preiudices, instilled by education against the truth.

The eight Conuiction.

30. **T**Hey who against the saluation of that Church from which they separate, protest through extreme want of charity, partiality, and manifest iniustice, through hatred of that Church, not out of iudgment, are damnable Schismatiques. That Protestants of your stampe be such is manifest by your wordes and deedes. *Cap. 3. n. 63. circa finem. We Protest and proclaime the contrary, and that we haue very little hope of their saluation, who either out of negligence in seeking the truth, or unwillingnesse to fynd it, lyue and dye in the errours and impieties of that Church. And c. 5. n. 34. in fine, you tell vs, That God is infinitely iust, and therefore it is to be feared, will not pardon Roman Catholiques, who might easily haue knowne the truth, and either through pride, or obstinacy, or negligence would not. And (a) Pag. 389. lin. 10. To lyue and dye in the Roman Church, is as dangerous as to shoote a gulfe, which* ^{(a) Cap. 7. n. 6. in} *though some good ignorant soules may do and escape, yet it fine. may be, well feared scarce one in a hundred, but miscarries.*

31. This you make the case of poore Catholiques euen of good ignorant soules, if happily they erre, and might haue byn rid of their errours, by speaking with so learned and Religious a Teacher as you *M. William Chillingsworth* are. There is little hope of their saluation, because they were vnwilling to conferre with you, as supposing for certaine, you could be of no credit to oppose, and accuse (as you do) the whole Christian Church.

Church of all ages as subiect to vniuersall damnable errors. On the other side, if your Protestants erre, not through negligence onely, but through (b) *passion, pride, obstinacy, through sinne of the will, as millions of them you feare do, I pray you is there any hope they shall be saued? What hope say you? Spes est rei incerta nomen.* — There is no doubt but these Protestants shall be saued. This you teach: for hauing pag. 136. endeauored to excuse their contentions by laying the fault on Scriptures seeming conflicts with it selfe, (c) *Pag. 137. lin. 1. you add. Besides though we grant that Scripture, Reason and Authority were all on one side, & the apparences of the other side all answerable: yet if we consider the strange power, that education & preiudices instilled by it, haue ouer euen excellent vnderstandings, we may well imagine, that many truths which in themselves are reuealed plainly inough, are yet to such or such a man prepossessed with contrary opinions, not reuealed playnly.* NEITHER DOUBT I, but God who knowes whereof we are made, and what passions we are subiect vnto, will compassionate our infirmities, and not enter into iudgement with vs for those things, which all things considered were vnauoydable. Thus you. Who are lyke a lyke may be to that naughty Seruant in the Gospell, who hauing ob-
tained of his Lord remission of a debt of ten thousand talents, presently tooke his fellow seruant by the throat and would haue choked him for a debt of an hundred pence.

(b) Cap. 3. n. 52. lin. 7. Betrayed into and kept in error by their fault, vice or passion, by pride, obstinacy, (as most men are) pag. 21. lin. 40. If any protestant or Papist be betrayed into, or kept in any error by any sinne of his will, as it is to be feared many millions are.

(c) Cap. 3. n. 9. aliter 19. in fine.

32. Let vs set before vs two men, the one a Protester, who through the preiudices of pride and presumption on his owne wyt, through proud contempt of the whole Catholique Church, of generall Councils, of consent of Fathers, instilled into him by education erreth against plaine Scripture: On the other a Roman

Catho-

Catholique, who through reuerence to the authority of the present Church, to the Church of all ages, to generall Councils, to the consent of Fathers, instilled into him by education, neglects to heare your wisdom, and thereby is kept in some error against Scripture, which by hearing a man of so great learning and Religion, he might (as you thinke) haue auoyded; let any man of discretion and conscience be iudge, whether the former Errant do not sin ten hundred thousand tymes, that is, incomparably, more then the later. And yet you leaue little hope of saluation to the later Catholique ignorant good-soule, who (if he sinne at all in neglecting your wisdom, perswading him to trust his owne wyt) sinneth onely out of a too low conceipt of himselfe, and of his owne wyt, and through too much respect to generall Councils and Christian consent of holy Fathers: Whereas that other Protesting proud foole, who both obstinately and erroneously resists all Christian Churches, generall Councils, and consent of Fathers, through confidence on his owne wyt, through contempt of all others instilled into him by education shall (you say) without doubt be saued.

33. God (say you) is infinitely iust, and therefore there is little hope of saluation for Papists if they erre, though but of onely negligence and vnwillingnes to seeke the truth. But he is infinitely good, and therefore though we Protesters hold errors against plain Scripture out of passion and pride (auersions, contempt of the Church, and the Pastours thereof) instilled by education, there is no danger. God knoweth that to these passions of pride, presumption, contempt, we by education are subiect, and so without doubt will compassionate our infirmities, and not enter into Iudgement with vs for such things

things, which all things considered were vnauoydable. Poore men blinded with selfe conceyt, who thinke your will and pleasure shall at the last day be the rule and measure of diuine Iustice; who vainly flatter your selues, and thinke you may deale with God as you do with vs. No, no: You will suffer vs to speake *much truth together*, if it be to no purpose against you, or you be willing it should be truth. But the *truth* of Gods most iust sentence you shall endure and suffer, will you, nil you, though it be most hatefull to you, and terrible against you. Then you will find, that as no one sentence was oftner repeated by the Iudge liuing in this world; so none will be found more true at the last day then this, *He that humbleth himselfe shall be exalted, and he that exalteth himselfe shalbe humbled*. It is then manifest that with extreme malice, partiality, iniustice, you separate from hope of Saluation the Catholique Church, from which you are separated, and soe are guilty of Schisme, and of most malicious and damnable Schisme.

That



That Protesters are Heretiques.

CHAP. VII.

THIS was part of the title of the last Chapter; but because the matter is distinct, to the end that no one Chapter or matter hold vs ever long, I haue deuised the former into two. To make the Title good, we must declare & suppose the definition and nature of Heresy. Christian sayth stands vpon two grounds or principles, *diuine Reuelation*, and the *external Proposition thereof*; For we cannot by Christian sayth belieue any thing which is not reuealed of God, nor what is reuealed of God is credible and worthy to be credited and believed of vs, till the same be externally proposed to vs by some credible witnesse. For as we could not belieue the word of God, were not the Authour infinitely credible and worthy of credit; so likewise our perswasion cannot rest firmly vpon the proposition, that God hath reuealed such thinges, except the Proponent be evidently credible of it selfe. This you affirme *Pag. 62. n. 25. & pag. 69. lin. 7. Cap. 2. n.* *That our inquisition of what is reuealed of God, neuer ceaseth 25 & n.* *till at last we find a principle to be rested on for it selfe, which 45.* *may be a rocke and ground vnto our beliefe. Hence there be*

X

two

two Aduersaries of Christian fayth, Ethnicisme, and Heresy: *Ethnicisme* opposeth and denieth expressely Christian doctrine to be diuine reuelation, and calleth in question the authority of God. *Heresy* opposeth the authority of the Christian *Proponent* of diuine Reuelations, and though he professe to belieue Christian doctrines & diuine reuelations, yet in the question, which in particular they be, he will be his owne chooser, as the word *Heresy* doth declare, being in english the same as *Choyce*.

2. Whosoever then refuseth to belieue any doctrine proposed to him by the last Christian Principle and rule evidently credible of it selfe, such a man is an Heretique, and to be accounted as a *Heathen and Publican*. As whome we cannot make to see the light of the sunne shining at noone day, we leaue him for a blind man; whome we cannot make to apprehend the prime principles of reason eident of themselues, we leaue him for a sot, and vncapable of learning: So whome we cannot wyn to belieue, what is proposed by the last and vttermoost euidence, Christian Proposition can possibly haue, we leaue him for wilfully blind, for one voyd of fayth, for a *heathen and publican*. For what can we do to him more? If such an one be not an Hereticke, that is, vnder the name of a Christian, a wilfull obstinate opposer of diuine Reuelations sufficiently proposed to him, how can any man possibly be an Hereticke?

(a) Sec.
edition.
cap. 4. n.
4 post
medium.

3. Some may say, if he see the doctrine to be containned in Scripture, and yet disbelieve it, then is he an Hereticke. I answere, then he is not an heretique, but a Heathen, openly and formally an Infidell. For you say (a) Pag. 194. lin. 14. To disbelieve any doctrine which one knowes to be reuealed in Scripture, is for a Christian not only

impious,

impious, but also impossible.

D. Field.
of the
Church.
l. 3 c. 5.

4. Some may also pretend, that an Hereticke is one, that erreth about some truth, which doth directly and essentially concerne matter of Saluation, though he ioyne not obstinacy to his errour. But this is manifestly false. An Hereticke is one hatefull, horrible, and detestable, but a man that erreth in matters of saluation ignorantly for want of sufficient instruction and proposition, is com- miserable and to be pittied, not to be abhorred. He that being in the darke seeth not the meate that is neere him, and so starueth for want of food, cannot be said to be a blind man, or a wilfull staruer of himselfe: so the Christian who doth erre about some essentiall points of Saluation, the necessary food of the soule, & so perish- eth, because the light of credibility doth not shine vpon it in respect of him, cannot be said to be an Hereticke, or an Infidell, but only in this respect an vnhappy wretch; though this case among Christians can hardly happen. Finally an Hereticke is one that erreth through inward indisposition to belieue: but the man that doth disbelieve a truth, only because he is not sufficiently in- structed, may want no good disposition and readines of mind to belieue; Ergo, he cannot be an Hereticke.

(a) Cap.
2. 155.

(b) Cap.
2 n. 28.

(c) Cap.
2 n. 3.

That
Scrip-
ture can-

not be

proued

to be a

perfect

rule by

its owne

saying

so but

only by

Traditi-
on,

which is

a thing

credible

5. Now this mayne and last principle for resolution of the Controuersy, which be diuine Reuelations, is the Christian Catholique Church deliuering perpetu- all Traditions from the Apostles, or, which is all one, as you confesse, (a) *Vniuersall Tradition is the rule to iudge all controuersies by* (b) *being a thing credible of it selfe, and therefore fit to be rested on.* Other principles and rules though they be not euident of themselues, yet are good stayes of our fayth, because euidently (c) conioyned with this principle of *Tradition, credible of it selfe, a-*

gainst all which your Protestants or Protesters directly oppose, and so erre fundamentally, and are Heretickes, as these Arguments conuince.

The first Conuiction.

6. **I**rst I prooue them to be Heretickes against their owne last Principle and rule, their rocke pillar and ground, the Scripture, euident of it selfe and known to be the word of God by its owne glorious beames & rayes. Though somtimes you reiect this Principle, as not onely false, but also (a) *fond, ridiculous, unworthy to be the conceyt of any wise man*; yet to keepe your good purpose of contradicting your selfe in euery thing, you approue it also, c. 4. n. 53. lin. 25. where to the question, *What assurance is there, that the Scripture is the word of God*, you answere, *The doctrine it selfe is very fit, and worthy to be thought to come from God, nec vox hominem sonat*. What is this but to make the Scripture credible and worthy of credit for it selfe, seeing the credibility or worthines of credit Scripture hath from its owne doctrine, stile, & language, it hath of it selfe. But howsoeuer Scripture be not the last stay of your beliefe in the question, *Whether it be the word of God*; yet in respect of your Fayth of the sense of Scripture, you make Scripture the last Principle, yea the onely rule thereof, cleere, manifest, euident of it selfe. This supposed I subsume: but Protestants disbelieue doctrines proposed cleerly and plainly by Scripture, through *preiudices and passions instilled into them by education*, as you confesse pag. 137. lin. 6. and there be millions of them that are betrayed into errour, not by ignorance, but by the *sinfull and damnable passions of their will*, pag. 21. lin. 40. Ergo, Protestants erre fundamentally, and are prooued Heretickes by their owne fundamentall

(a) Cap.
6. n. 55.
Cap. 2. n.
47.

Cap. 3. n.
19. lin.
18.
Second
Edit. pa.
21. lin. 4.

tall rule and last Principle of fayth : for if they be not Heretickes who contradict a doctrine which is proposed vnto them by cleere , plaine , and euident texts of Scripture ; it is not possible there should be any Hereticke by their grounds.

7. This is confirmed , because the same Protestants belieue truths, proposed vnto them by texts not so cleer and euident , as those are the true sense whereof they disbelieve: *Ergo*, the cause why they do not belieue other more plainly and cleerely proposed Truths, is not want of credibility in the proposition, nor of faculty in their vnderstandings , but want of disposition to belieue in their wils. This you confesse saying, *That truths reuealed Pag. 137. in Scripture plainly inough in themselves, be not plainly reuealed to such and such men, into whome passions and preiudices against such truths haue beene by education instilled.* Now to disbelieve truths proposed sufficiently and inough by plaine texts of Scripture (that is, in your way, with the vttermost light and euidence of credibility any Christian proposition can possibly haue) not to belieue I say, truths so proposed through passion and preiudice, is the formall crime of Hereticall obstinacy & wilfull blindnes.

8. Hence we may further conclude, that disagreeing Protestants are Heretiques to ech other , and their dissensions Hereticall on the one side, or on both. As to say of one, he wants light to see the sunne shining at noone day, is to say he is starke blind ; To say of one he wants wit to appehend the truthes that are euident of themselves is to say , he is a foole ; so to say of one that he wants disposition to belieue Christian doctrine proposed by cleare and manifest Scripture, is to say, he is an Infidell, and voyd of Fayth, if doctrine proposed by cleere texts

(a) Pag.
336. n. 19.
and else
where a
hundred
times.

of Scripture, *be hoc ipso* proposed to Christian believers sufficiently and inough, as Protesters teach and must teach, else no doctrine can be in their Religion proposed sufficiently and inough. What you so often (a) object that then the Dominicans should be *Heretiques* vnto *Iesuites*, because in the opinion of *Iesuites* their opinion is cleere-ly repugnant to Scripture, is fruolous and vaine. For to *Iesuits* and *Dominicans* the sole evidence of the text of Scripture is not sufficient proposition (because many plaine texts are not to be vnderstood in the plaine and litterall sense), but that the proposition of Scripture be sufficient, the evidence of the text must be backt and strengthened by the Tradition, definition, or declaration of the Church : Now you and your Protesters hold the sense, of Scripture, proposed by the meere inward evidence of the text, onely and alone, to be the last and vttermost evidence of credibility a Christian doctrine can haue, the rocke and pillar of belife : *Ergo*, when you accule ech other of disbelieuing eident and plaine Scripture, you accuse ech other of the formall & proper crime of heresy : so that Protesters are, according to *S. Paul*, *delinquishers* of the Church, conuined, and condemned by their owne Iudgement.

The second Conuiction.

10. **T**HEY that protest against the pillar, ground, rocke of that Credit and Authority which doth vp hold, propose, and expose all truth of Saluation vnto Christian belife, and make the same worthy of all credit in respect of us, erre fundamentally and are damned Heretickes. This is manifest by what is prooued in the *Preface* of this Chapter. But you protest against

gainst such a Rocke, for you protest against the Catho-
 lique present Church of euery age since the Apostles,
as subiect to fundamentall and damnable errors, and euer
 stayned, euen in the second age immediately vpon the
 death of the Apostles, with vniuersall errors; whose
 Catholique externall Communion you haue forsaken,
 because vniuersally polluted with superstitions, as you
 confesse, and professe to glory therein. Now, that the
 present Catholique vniuersall Church in euery age, is
 the pillar, (c) ground, rocke, that is, teacher of all Christian
 truth by duty and office, and in fact alwayes the pillar and
 ground, that is, the maintayner, and teacher of all necessary
 truth, which she could not be, vnles she were infallible in all
 her proposalls: these things you grant as hath bin shewed
 at large in the fift Chapter: Ergo, Protesters are guilty
 of Heresy, as ouerthrowers of the rocke, pillar, & last
 Principle of Christian fayth.

Cap. 5. n.
 88. circa.
 medium.
 Cap. 5. n.
 91. paulo
 post me-
 dium.

Cap. 5. n.
 52.
 Cap. 3. n.
 77. & n.
 78.
 (d) Pag.
 108. n.
 139.
 Cap. 2. n.
 139.

II. Moreouer, you graunt Tradition vniuersall
 to be the last Principle of Christian fayth, euident of it
 selfe and so the pillar and ground of all truth, fit to be
 rested on. But by making the Church fallible, and sub-
 iect to error in deliuering Apostolicall Traditions,
 you destroy this Rocke, and make the same no ground
 to be rested on in any kind of truth. For, say you, an au-
 thority subiect (e) to error cannot be a firme foundation of
 my beliefe in any thing: and Cap. 5. n. 91. lin. 40. expressly
 to this purpose you say; *If the Church were obnoxious to*
corruptions, as we pretend, who can possibly warrant vs, that
part of this corruption did not get in and preuaile in the 5. or
4. or 3. or 2. age? &c. The error of the Millenaries was,
 you say, in the second age vniuersall, and what was done in
 some was possible in others. Now seing the authority of the
 Scripture, and of the foure Ghospels, and our whole
 Christian

(e) Cap.
 3. n. 36.
 lin. 12.

Christian fayth depend vpon the tradition of the primitive Church, you that make the authority of the primitive Church and Tradition, subiect to errour and fallible; how do not you erre most fundamentally, destroying the last stay and only rocke to be rested on by Christian beliefe? Tradition primitive vniuersall being vncertaine and fallible, what certainty can Christians haue of the Scriptures being from God, (f) *the testimony of the ancient Churches*, the only meanes of our certainty in this point being vncertaine?

(f) Pag.
61. lin.
34. Only
by the te-
stimony
of the an-
cient
Churches

The third Conuiction.

12. **I**F the Roman Church be the pillar, ground, rocke, that is, the teacher both by duty and in deed of all Christian truth; then *Protesters* against the Church of *Rome* be Heretickes as you graunt, and must needes graunt. But the Antecedent is true and proued euidently by what you graunt, and by what hath been shewed to be consequent of your grants, that there must be alwayes a Church of one denomination, alwayes *in fact*, even by essence the teacher of all fundamentall truth, visibly discerned from other Christian Societies, by this note of Vnity and Subordination to One. Now, if there must be alwayes such a *one Church*, the Roman must of necessity be *this Church*. This consequence you denied as we noted before, which now I make good by this Argument. The Church which can, must, and in fact doth performe the office of guide and directour, must be of one denomination subiect to one certain Bishop, and also vniuersal, Apostolicall, one & the same euery where for matters of fayth. But there is no Church of one denomination in the world noted with these markes, but only the Roman: *Ergo*, the Roman,

Supra c.
6. con-
uict. 2.

man, and only the Roman is that Church of one denomination and obedience, wherein a knowne infallibility is *Cap. 3. n.* settled, by adhering to which men are guided to believe aright *39. lin.* in all fundamentals. The maior proposition of this argument I prooue by what you write pag. 91. (a) where you (a) *Cap.* apply a testimony of S. Austin against vs: *Euery one may 2. n. 101.* see, that you so few (in comparison of all those, on whose consent we ground our believe of Scripture) so turbulent, that you damne all to the fire and to Hell, that any way differ from you &c. Lastly so new in many of your doctrines, as in the lawfulness and expedience of debarring the Laity the Sacramentall Cup, the lawfulness & expedience of your Latin service, Transubstantiation, Purgatory, the Popes infallibility, authority ouer Kings &c. So new, I say, in respect of the vndoubted Bookes of Scripture, which contayneth or rather is our Religion, and the sole and adequate obiect of our fayth: I say, euery one may see, that you so few, so turbulent, so new can produce nothing deserving authority.

13. This whole discourse (though the last two lines only be sufficient to my purpose) I haue produced at large, that the Reader might see by this patterne (for all your Booke is of the same stile, methode, and pith) what a Kilcow-Disputant you are, that is, a curst Cow with short hornes, yea without hornes at all: for your Heart is not so curst and fierce in vttering, what you conceaue to the discredit of the Roman Church; but your Vnderstanding is as weake and faynt in proouing what you say. You haue heaped together many doctrines of the Roman Church, which you traduce as nouelties; but in all your discourse there is not any strength of Argument, to shew them to be such. So we cannot say of you — *Cornu ferit ille, caneto*; for you strike vs only with the bare forehead of impudent assertion,

sertion, without prooffe, yea without offer or proffer of prooffe. Nor could you prooue them, these being for the most part, all manifest Christian truths, which you would haue taken vpon your bare word to be errours.

(a) *Luc.* For how can you prooue, that Communion in one
24.30.31. kind, for *Laymen*, was not practised by our Lord and Sa-
(b) *Ang.* uiour, giuen vnto the two (a) *lay* Disciples in *Emmaus*?
lib 2 de Was not the *Latin service* euery where in vse, during
doctrine. the Primitiue tymes, I meane (b) in all Countreyes of
Christ. c. Europe and *Africke*, which did pertayne to the Latin
11. part of the word? Was not Purgatory believed, and (c)
(c) *Ma-* prayer for the reliefe of the dead practised by the peo-
chab. l. 2. ple of God, euen before the Ghospell was written? Do
c. 12. not (d) Protestants professe, that *Transubstantiation* is
(d) *Mor-* as true and ancient as the Ghospell, if the words of our
son of the Lord be certainly true in the plaine and proper sense? And be
Sacramē not his words true in that sense he spake them, though
lib. 2. c. 1. If the words of the same be neuer so high, obscure, & to human vnder-
pag. 91. standing incomprehensible? But your discourse though
true in a obiect to vs, you will be sure it shall neuer be without
proper hornes of stiffe and direct Contradiction against your
and lite- selfe: for euen this short period hath two hornes of this
ral sense, kind. First where you say, *We damne all to Hell fire that*
then are we to any way differ from vs, whereas more then fourty times
yield in your booke you say, you (e) damne vs to Hell as much
Transub- as we do you, and that, we grant (f) *Saluation to Protestants as*
stantiati- much as they do to vs. Secondly you say heere, that the
on &c. Scripture is the sole and adæquate obiect of your faith;
(e) pag. but else where you say often, that it is no obiect of your
40 + lin. 7. fayth at all, but only the meanes of believing. *Cap. 2. n.*
We cen- 32. lin. 5. *Scripture conteynes all materiall obiects of fayth,*
sure your er- *Whereof the Scripture is NONE, but ONELY the meanes*
rours as *of conueying them to vs.*

14. Now

14. Now to our purpose, I take out of your dunghill heavily
 this gem of cleere and manifest truth, worthy of S. An- as you
 stin his diuine wit and sayth; that the Church which do ours.
 preferreth authority which is euidently credible of it selfe, the (f) Pag.
 pillar and ground of truth, must not consist of a few, but be lin. 15.
 diffused and spread ouer the world; nor of turbulent per You
 sons that are full of discord and contention one against your
 another, but all agreeing in full vnity about matters of selfe af-
 fayth; not a new Church founded in after tymes, but in firme
 stituted by the blessed Apostles, adorned with an illu norant
 strious succession of knowne Bishops to this present. Prote-
 stants
 which is the very Maior proposition of my Argument, dying
 which was, that the Church which is the pillar and with
 ground, that is the teacher alwaies without fayle of all contriti-
 necessary truth, must be both of one Denomination and on may
 be saued.
 Catholique, that is, vniuersally Apostolicall by succession
 of Bishops from them, one and the same euery where for
 matters of faith. For if it be not such, but a company of
 a few, in one corner of the world, deuided into innu-
 merable factions and sectes, founded not by the Apo-
 stles but only yesterday, or within the memory of men,
 it can prefferre no authority.

15. Now, what more euident then the Minor of my Ecclesia
 former argument, No Church of the world, but the Roman totum
 is adorned with these glorious markes, shewing the euident cre- possidet
 dibility of that Church, in which they are. For dare you quod a
 say your Protesting Church is dilated ouer the word? viro ac-
 Is it not confined to one corner of Europe, and reigneth cepit in
 most in the climate which is most North, dotem.
 quæcun-
 que con-
 gregatio
 cuiusli-
 bet hæ-
 resis in
 angulis

Quod latus mundi nebula, malusque

Iupiter urget? —

Can you say that your Church is one & the same euery
 where, and not deuided into turbulent factions and
 sects

sedet. iects? Do not you say (a) there is among them infinite
 concu- variance, and King James (b) an infinite diuersity of Sects
 binaest. agreeing in nothing but in union against the Pope? Can you
 non ma- say it is Apostolicall, hauing succession from the Apo-
 trona. stles? Do not you confesse it began but yesterday by
 Augu- deuiding themselues from the externall communion of the
 tin. l. 4. de symb. Roman, and whole Catholique Church?
 c. 10.

(a) Pag. 16. On the other side, can you deny the Roman to
 90. lin. be spread ouer the world, to be in *Europe, Africke, Asia,*
 12. *America*, & almost in all countries of these foure qua-
 (b) A- ters of the world, euery where famously knowne; that
 gainst D. euery man that will be saued, may come to this rocke &
 Vorstius be built thereon vnto euerlasting saluation? For what
 pag. 65. you say cap. 6. n. 53. *That the Roman Church is like the frog*
in the fable, who thought the ditch he liued in to be all the world,
 is a speach not of truth and reason, but of preiudice &
 passion which education hath instilled into you; the
 passion, I say, and custome of lying and vttering any
 falshood or scornefull reproach that may disgrace the
 Roman Church. This you do without remorse of Con-
 science, because you say, you are sure without doubt, God
 Pag. 137. will not enter into Iudgement with you for such passions,
 n. 12. which custome and education haue made to you vnauoydable;
 Which I will belieue if you can make me sure, that God
 did not damne to Hell *Nero, Domitian*, and such other
 Monsters for their pride and contempt of God and pre-
 iudices against Religion, which by education, and custome
 were to them all things considered, vnauoydable.

17. The Church of *Rome* is also Apostolicall by a
 (c) Aug. notorious succession of Bishops from *S. Peter*, that we
 in Psal. may with *S. Austyn* (c) say to you: Number the Bishops
 contra succeeding in the sea of *Peter*, this is the Rocke the
 partem proud gates of Hell do not conquer. This Church is also
 Donati. the

the same euer y where in all the professours thereof for matters of Fayth. This you confesse pag. 129. and very wittily, and prettily contradict your selfe within few lines. In that pag. 129. n. 4 you speake to vs, *If you say, you do agree in matters of Fayth, I say this is ridiculous. For you define matters of Fayth to be those things, wherein you agree; so that to say you agree in all matters of fayth, is to say you agree in those things wherein you do agree. But you are all agreed that onely those things wherein you agree are matters of Fayth. And Protestants if they were wyse would do so to. Sure I am, they haue reason inough to do so, seeing all of them agree with explicite fayth in all those things which are plainely and vndoubtedly deliuered in Scripture. Thus you. Is not this a wise discourse of a man who holdes his discourse to be infallible, and (a) that thereby he cannot possibly be* (a) Pre-
Lead into error? Protestants all of them great and little, men & women belieue with explicite fayth all things what- soeuer are plainely and vndoubtedly deliuered in Scripture. Is not this ridiculous? Credat Iudeus Apella, Non ego. You say it is ridiculous, that we define matters of fayth to be those wherein we agree, and then say, we agree in all mat- ters of fayth. And yet presently you say, that Protestants if they were wyse would do so too, to wit, agree that those things onely wherein they agree, be matters of fayth, & then stop our mouthes, when we reproach them with disa- greements, by saying they agree in all matters of fayth; because matters of fayth be those onely wherein they agree. Is this discourse coherent? If it be ridiculous in us to do so, how were it wisdom for Protestants to do the same? And how haue they reason, & reason inough why they might do so? Though also it be false, that we define matters of fayth to be those wherein we agree. We define matters of fayth to be all doctrines proposed

face n.

12.

By dis-
course
no man
can pos-
sibly be
lead into
errour.

by the Church as her traditions or definitions, wherein all Catholiques must agree.

The fourth Conviction.

18. **I** proue directly by the word of God the Roman Church, that is, the Church subiect to *S. Peter* and his successour, to be *the Church of one denomination*, which is the pillar and ground of truth. There was alwayes (as you haue confessed by force) a Catholique visible church *by duty* & in deed, the teacher of necessary truth, & that no Church is fit, or able to performe this office which is not of one denomination; *Ergo* this Church was built dependently vpon one Rocke, subordinately to one visible head, by Christ Iesus our Lord: because such a Church could not be instituted but by him as is manifest. But Christ did not institute or build any Church of one denomination, but onely on *S. Peter*, *Thou art Peter (a Rocke) and vpon this Rocke I will build my Church: To the I will giue thee keyes of the Kingdome of Heauen: Doeſt thou loue me, feed my lambes, feed my sheepe.* What can be more cleere? Now this power of Rocke to vphold, this authority of Pastour to guide, this Superiority of Head to gouerne the vniuersall Church of one denomination, was to descend, and did descend to *S. Peters* successours. This cannot be denied; because this Church was to be alwayes successiue in the world, *Ergo* the Rocke sustayning it, the Pastour guiding it, the Head ruling it, was to be alwayes successiue in the world, which is to say, that *S. Peter* must alwayes haue a successour in the Headship of the one Church, which I furthermore prooue in this manner.

19. If the institution of the *Apostles* to be Priests by these wordes, *do this in remembrance of me*, do import that
the

Math.
16.
Ioan 21.

the Apostles should haue successours in their Priesthood ; then this institution of *S. Peter* , to be the one Pastour and Guide of the Church, doth import that he should haue a successour in that office of Pastour. For as Priesthood was not instituted for the *Apostles* sake, but for the *diuine worship* , which was to continue in the Christian Church till the world ended : So the Pastourship of *S. Peter* ouer the one Christian Church & flocke, was not instituted for *S. Peters* sake , but for the good of Christians, that by adhering to one guide they might all vnitedly be lead into all truth. But the Institution , *Do this in remembrance of me*, doth import successours in Priesthood ; Ergo this Institution, *feede my sheepe* , doth import the office of Guide and Pastour , was to go to *S. Peters* successours , vntill the consummation of the world. But you say pag 62. n. 23. *If our Saviour had intended, that all Controuersies in Religion should be by some visible Iudge finally determined; who can doubt, but in playne tearmes he would haue expressed himselfe about this matter? He would haue sayd playnly, The Bishop of Rome I haue appointed to decide all controuersies.* Thus you.

20. And this is your perpetuall impertinency of arguing by interrogations , supposing that to be vndeniable truth, which is manifest falshood, for which you can say nothing. This manner of arguing you vse often through whole pages and leaues togeather, that should I transcribe the places I might set downe more then halfe of your booke. But now to your question ; Who can doubt, but Christ would haue said plainely *the Bishop of Rome I haue appointed to decide all Controuersies?* I answer, euery man that hath any braines or wit in his head. For such an one cannot but see, that Christ our Lord could not haue said, as you would haue him to haue

haue spoken, without vntruth. For though he did appoint that *S. Peter* and his successour should be the Guide and Pastour of his flocke, yet that *S. Peter* or his successour should be the Bishop of *Rome* more then of *Hierusalem*, or *Antioch*, this he did not appoint, at the least whiles he liued on earth. Why may it not suffice you, that by cleere Scripture, and by what you your selfe grant, *S. Peters* successour is to be for euer the guide and Pastour of the Church of one denomination, the pillar and ground of Truth? Do you doubt whether the Roman Bishop be *S. Peters* successour, or no? Of this you cannot doubt, if you will not stagger at your owne principle, which you deliuer as vndeniable *Cap. 4. num. 53. li. 20. All wise men for the assurance of truth in all matters of belicfe, relye vpon the consent of ancient Records and vniuersal Tradition.* Now *vninersal Tradition* doth deliuer by full consent, that *S. Peter* was Bishop of *Rome*, and that the Bishop of *Rome* is his successour. Or if you doubt of this, you may as well doubt whether euer *Iulius Caesar* was at *Rome*.

The fifth Conuiction.

21. **T**Hat the Bishop of *Rome* is appointed of God to decide all emergent Controuersies, I proue by Principles acknowledged and set downe by your selfe. For whereas the *Mainteyner of Charity* sayth, that Protestants deprive *S. Peter* and his successours of the Authority which Christ our Lord conferred vpon them, ouer his whole militant Church, which is a point confessed by Protestants to be of great Antiquity, and for which they reprove diuers of the most holy Ancient Fathers, as Brerely sheweth at large; you, c. 5. n. 98. first question the worth and authority of the holy Fathers, as no certaine rule of fayth: then

then write in this sort *lin. 14.* Yet this I say not, as if I did acknowledge what you pretend, that Protestants did confesse the Fathers against them in this point: for the point here issuable is not, Whether S. Peter were head of the Church, nor whether the Bishop of Rome had any priority in the Church; nor whether he had any authority ouer it giuen him by the Church; but whether by diuine right, and by Christs appointment he were head of the Catholique Church. Now hauing perused Brerely, I cannot find any Protestant confessing any one Father to haue concurred in opinion with you in this point. Thus you. From these words we haue this great Truth, (which by the consent of ancient Records, & vniuersal Tradition is most certaine and vndeniable) that S. Peter and his succellour for the time, was euer acknowledged to be the Head of the Catholique Church, with authority ouer it in all Ecclesiasticall causes. You adde, that the point here issuable and controuerted betwixt Protestants and vs, is not, whether he had his authority (for hereof you seeme to suppose, that Protestants make no controuersy) but only whether by *diuine right and our Lords appointment* he were Head of the Catholique Church. Now I assume; If he were Head of the Church, he was so by diuine right, & Christs appointment, and could not be so by human institution. How proue I this? Euen by your owne words *Pag. 60 nu. 22.* For the deciding of ciuill controuersies men may appoint themselves a Iudge: but in matters of Religion this office may be giuen to none, but whome God hath designed for it. Thus you; hence I inforce the Conclusion, by ioyning together in forme of discourse your two Propositions: S. Peter and the Roman Bishop his Succellour was euer held by the consent of Fathers the Head, the Pastour, the Iudge of the Catholike Militant Church: But he could not

be so by the appointment of men; Ergo, he was so by diuine right, and by the institution of Christ our Lord.

22. And I wonder, what did beare your eyes in perusing Brerely, that you could not see in him so much as one Protestant confessing any one Father to haue concurred in opinion with vs in this point. For doth he not cite the Centurists (a) *Centur. 3. c. 4.* (that is, a masse of Protestants at once) who reprehend *col. 84. lin. 60.* Tertullian for agreeing herein with vs, saying, (a) Tertullian did erroneously thinke the Keyes to haue bene committed to Peter alone, and the Church to be builded on him: Who charge S. Cyprian for his affirming (b) the Church to haue bene *Centur. 3. c. 4.* built vpon Peter, and one (c) Chaire founded by our Lords *(c) Col. 84. lin. 60.* voyce vpon the rocke; and that (d) there ought to be one Bishop in the Catholique Church; and for calling Peters Chayre *(d) Col. 84. lin. 44.* (e) the principall Church, from whence Priestly vnity ariseth; and lastly for his teaching (say they) without any *(e) Col. 84. li. 19.* foundation of Scripture, that (f) the Roman Church ought to be acknowledged of all other, the Mother and roote of the *(f) Col. 84. lin. 31.* Catholique Church. They likewise reprehend as a corrupt saying, concerning the Primacy of the Roman Church, that of Irenaus, All Churches ought to agree with the Roman Church, in regard of a more powerable Principality.
- (g) *Cap. 6. n. 30.* 23. You more then once fall vpon (g) Cardinal Peron, & This is his noble Translatresse about this place, *Ad quam propter* fallly *potentio-rem principatitatem necesse est omnem conuenire Ec-* translated (say cle-*cliam*, which they turne thus in English, To which you) for Church it is necessarie, that euery Church should agree in re- *conueni-* gard of more powerfull principality: you say they make *re ad Ro-* bold with the Latin tongue, as though *conuenire* did signify *manam* nifie to agree, whereas it doth signifie to resort. Hence of *Ecclesiam* this sentence, *ad quam propter potentio-rem principatitatem* euery *necesse est omnem conuenire Ecclesiam*, you make this con- body knows struction: To this Church, by reason of the powerfull principality

pality it bath ouer all the adiacent Churches, there is, and a-
 wayes bath bene a necessity of perpetuall recourse of all the
 faythfull round about. Thus you, shewing your selfe to be
 no better a Grammarien then you are a Christian? Who
 euer did deny that *conuenire*, according to the proper-
 ty of the *Latin* tongue doth signifie to agree rather then
 to resort? I thinke the Lady translatresse, and euey La-
 dy that vnderstands English, know, that to resort, is to
 repayre frequently to a place, which *conuenire* doth no
 more signifie, then to leape ouer a ditch.

signifies
 no more
 then to
 resort
 &c.

24. But this is your audacity to make bold with La-
 tin, and then rayle against others who translate accor-
 ding to the property of the Latin, whereof I can giue
 another exemple. *S. Austin* against some abuses in his
 time sayth, *Qua in diuinis libris saluberrime praecepta sunt,*
minus curantur. This (say you) I suppose I may (a) very well
 render in our Saviours words, The commandments of Goa are
 layd aside. Thus you, and vpon this false translation, you
 slander and rayle at the Church in *S. Austins* time, as v-
 niuersally superstitious, for two pages togeather.

2 n. 47.
 pag. 136.
 Edit. 1.
 pag. 150:
 lin. 6.

25. Item Pag. 176. n. 76. in this place of *S. Paul* to *Timo-*
thy, *Quomodo oporteat te in domo Dei conuersari, quae est Ec-*
clesia Dei viui, & columna, & firmamentum Veritatis; you
 will haue *columna & firmamentum veritatis*, not to be re-
 ferred to the Church, with which it agreeeth in case,
 but to *Timothy* which is the accusatiue case by subaudi-
 tion of the particle *As, te vt columna & firmamentum veri-*
tatis, & in Greeke *οτι σολος ηγα ιδεαιωμεν*, iust as if one should
 say to you, *vt scias quomodo oporteat te subdi Archiepiscopo*
Cantuariensi, qui est successor Sancti Augustini, primas An-
glia, amicus veritatis: you should contend that *amicus ve-*
ritatis, were referred from his Grace to your selfe, by
 this construction, *quomodo oporteat te amicus veritatis*

Edit. 2.
 Cap. 3. n.
 76. li. 10.

subdi &c.

(a) *Pro
Sylla.*

(b) *Lib.
3. de fini-
bus.*

*De re
rustica c.
6. Varro.
lib. 1. cap.
29.*

26. But to returne to the place of *S. Irenaus*, I say, that *conuenire* doth signify to agree, not only when it is referred to a thinge, by the preposition *Cum*, as, *Conuenire cum aliquo*, but also many times when it is referred by the preposition *Ad*. When *Cicero* sayth, (a) *Conuenit ad eum hac contumelia*, will you translate, *this reproach resorteth to him*, and not, *agrees to him*? When he sayth (b) *Conuenit optimè ad pedem coturnus*, will you translate, the buskin resorteth to the foote, and not, agrees with the foote? when *Cato* and *Varro* say, as they do often, *conueniunt hæ vites ad quemuis agrum*, will you translate, these vine-trees resort to any soyle, and not, agree with any soyle? When *Plautus* sayth *conueniebat ad vaginam tuam machæra militis*, will you translate the blade of the soldier resorted to thy scabbard, and not, agreed with thy scabbard? Surely, if you do, you may giue the *Lady Translatresse* iust cause to smile at your simplicity, as now she hath cause to admire your ignorance in Latin, yea want of iudgment in playing *Monus* at her Translation. For euery man of wit and common sense must of necessity perceauē, that *S. Irenaus* could not meane corporall resorting to *Rome*, without being ridiculous. For though we should grant that *conuenire* may signifie to resort, yet it is cleere, that it doth not signify barely to resort, but to resort, or come to a place together, to meet therein one assembly. Now it is ridiculous to thinke, that *S. Irenaus* would haue all Churches, and all the faythfull on euery side to be bound not only to come to *Rome*; but also to come thither all at the same time, & at once. It is therefore manifest, that *S. Irenaus* doth attribute powerfull principality to the Roman Church & Bishop ouer all Christian Churches, by reason wherof all
other

other are bound and obliged in duty, to come together with the Church of Rome, not by corporal repayre to the Citty; but by consent of mind to the Roman Fayth. But this more powerfull Principality, this Iudicial Authority, and Headship, the Roman Bishop could not haue by gift of men, as you confesse: Ergo, he had it by diuine appointment as the successour of S. Peter, in whom by the voyce and word of our Lord it was instituted. So that Protesters by opposing the Church of Rome and S. Peters successour, oppose the ground and pillar of all Christian truth, and so are Heretiques.

The first Conuiction.

27. **T**HE visible Church is the Iudge of Controuersies, and therefore infallible in all her Proposals; so that to oppose her is as much as to oppose God himselfe: and consequently whosoever opposeth against the Doctrine of the visible Church is an Hereticke. This argument is proposed by the maintainer of Charity c. 6. n. 15. to which you answered cap. 6. n. 13. First you deny the Church to be Iudge of Controuersies: How (say you) can she be the Iudge of them, if she cannot decide them? and how can she decide them, if it be a question whether she be Iudge of them? That which is questioned it selfe cannot with any sense be pretended to be fit to decide Controuersies. Secondly you say: If she were iudge, it wold not follow that she were infallible, for we haue many Iudge in our Courts of Iudicature, yet none infallible. Thus you. How could you possibly be so obliuious, as not once to imagine, that both these answeres are direct Contradictions of what you before affirmed. Cap. 2. n. 162. you say, The Church hath authority of determining Controuersies of fayth, according to plaine and euident Scripture, and vniuer-

fall Tradition, and to excommunicate the man that should persist in error against her determinations. Now if she be not Iudge, if her authority be questioned, how can she do this? Secondly she being Iudge of Controuersies that she must be infallible, though Iudges in the Courts of Ciuill Iudicature be not such, you affirme cap. 2. n. 17. We are to obey the sentence of the (ciuill) Iudge, and not resist it, but not alwayes to belieue it iust: but in matters of Religion such a Iudge is required whome we should be bound to belieue to haue iudged right: so that in ciuill Controuersies euery honest and understanding man is fit to be a Iudge, but in Religion none but he that is infallible. Thus you: whose words cotaine an vnanswerable demonstration against your selfe, that the Church being Iudge to determine Controuersies of fayth, must of necessity be infallible.

(a) Cap. 28. Thirdly, you say, *That though she were a Iudge infallible, yet to oppose her declaration, would not be to oppose God, except the opposer know that she doth infallibly propose the word of God.* I answer, that to oppose the Propenent of fayth (a) which is evidently credible of it selfe, or evidently reduced to such an euident credible Principle, is Heresy, & a vertuall oppoting of God and his Reuelation. For the Proponer being a witnesse worthy of all credit, the disbelieuer of this proposition must of necessity assent, except he be mislead by Passiō against the truth reueal'd, or by pride against the proposer thereof as I shewed in the preface to the argumēt of this chapter.

The sequenth Conuiction.

29. **T**HE Church gathered together in Generall Councels, or a Generall Councell of Christian Bishops haue Power to propose & define with

with infallibility the Cōttouerfies of Religion & bind all Christians vnder paine of heresy to belieue their definitions. But Protesters oppose Generall Councils & such definitions of fayth which they know and confesse to haue beene enacted by them; contending that such Christian Assemblies, representing the whole Christian Church, are fallible, and haue beene many times false, as is notorious: *Ergo*, they contradict the infallible Proponent of Christian Fayth preferring their owne priuate fancies, and so are guilty of Hereticall obstinacy and pride. The *maior* Proposition of this argument is euident and vndeniable by the perpetuall Tradition and practise of all former Christian ages, euen of the Primitiue times. For though then they could not meet together all in one place, yet they did assemble generally in different places & determine the Controuersies of Religion against Heresies that did arise. In proote hereof the testimony of *Tertullian* is cleere and direct, mentioning generali Councils gathered by command no doubt of the Roman Bishop: *Aguntur praecepta per Graciam illas certis in locis Concilia, ex vniuersis Ecclesiis, per quae, & altiora quaeq; in commune tractantur, & ipsa representatio totius nominis Christiani magna veneratione celebratur.* Behold the notorious Antiquity of the Catholique Tradition about the venerable Authority of General Councells to determine the highest matters of Religion, as being the *representatiue* Church or *representations* of the whole Christian Name. Wherefore Protesters who contemne this Tradition euidently certaine or credible of it selfe, and oppose Generall Councils, cannot be excused from damnable Hereticall pride.

30. But Tradition though neuer so perpetuall and primitiue, full and vniuersall, will not grow in your gar-

De ieiunij cap. 13.

garden, except the same be watered from your Well, with whome nothing is well, but what is your owne, Thus you write c. 2. n. 85. lin 6. *This we know, that none is fit to pronounce for all the world a Iudiciall definitive obliging sentence in Controuersies of Religion, but onely such a Man or such a Society of men as is authorized thereto by God. And besides we are able to demonstrate, that it hath not become the pleasure of God to giue to any Man, or Society of men any such authority.* The truth of the first part of this saying will establish the authority of Generall Councils from God, when the fallhood of the second shall be confuted by D. Potter, yea by your owne contradiction thereof. D. Potter writeth pag. 165. *We say that such Generall Councils as are lawfully called, and proceed orderly, are great and awfull representations of the Church; that, they are the highest Tribunals the Church hath on earth; that, their Authority is immediatly deriued, and delegated from Christ; that, no Christian is exempted from their censures and iurisdiction; that, their decrees bind all persons to externall obedience, and may not be questioned but upon euident reason.* Behold D. Potter cryes, *We (Protestants) say that Generall Councils are authorized of God to pronounce a Iudiciall definitive sentence obliging all persons: and you cry the contrary, We say, and are able to demonstrate, that God hath not giuen any such authority to any Society, Councell, or Congregation of men.* How do you not feare least by thus contradicting your Potter, you incur the curle of the Prophet, *Va qui contradicis fidei tuo testa de Samijs terra:* Woe vnto thee that darest contradict thy Potter, though thou art but (a) a Samian Pot-sheard.

(a) Sa-
mosate-
nian.

31. But I can easely make you friends with the Doctour, shewing that else where you contradict your selfe, and agree with him, that Councils are authorized

of

of God to pronounce a definitiue obliging sentence, c. 4. n. 18. in fine: I willingly confesse, that the iudgement of a Councell, though not infallible, is yet so farre directiue and obliging, that without apparent reason to the Contrary, it may be sinne to reiect it, at least not to afford it outward submission for publique peace sake. Hence I thus argue: Christian Councels haue power to pronounce a Iudiciall definitiue obliging sentence as you confesse, and from that obligation you except no Christian, and consequently they can bind all persons of the Church, at the least to outward submission and externall obedience for peace sake. But none are fit to pronounce such a sentence, but such a Congregation or Society of men as are by God, authorized thereto, as you also affirme. Ergo, a Christian Councell or Conuocation of Bishops is authorized of God to pronounce a Iudiciall definitiue sentence obliging the whole Christian world.

32. And whereas you say with D. Potter, that such Councels be not infallible, and so may be questioned or reiected vpon euident reasons; and that they do bind vs to externall obedience for peace sake, but not to an inward assent that their Decrees are true; you contradict what you write pag. 59. n. 17. *In Ciuill Controuersies we are bound to obey the sentence of the Iudge, or not be resist it, but not alwayes to believe it iust: But in matters of Religion such a Iudge is required whom we should be obliged to believe to haue iudged right. So that in ciuill Controuersies euery honest understanding man is fit to be a Iudge, but in Religion none but he that is infallible.* Now seing you say cap. 2. n. 22. *That in matters of Religion the office of Iudge may be giuen to none but whome God hath designed for it, a Generall Councell which hath the office of Iudge to pronounce a Iudiciall obliging sentence in matters of Religion, must of ne-*

A a

cessity

cessity be infallible, and bind Christians not onely to outward submission; but also to believe, that it hath iudged right and according to the word of God: Except you will say, that God doth assigne and authorize such Iudges *as are not fit for the office*, nor such as the state of Religion doth require. Besides, to say that Generall Councils haue authority immediatly from Christ to bind all persons to externall obedience, and yet that such Councils be fallible, and false many times; what is it but to say, that Christ hath appoynted such Authority & gouvernement in his Church, by the force wherof men are bound to dissemble and play the Hypocrites in matters of Religion? For example, Generall Councils haue defined, *That Communion in one kind is lawfull* & command all Christians to approue and practise it. You are perswaded in conscience, that this is vnlawfull, a sacrilegious mayming of the Sacrament, and yet by your doctrine, *That Councils bind at the least to outward submission and externall obedience*, you are bound outwardly to practise it, and to make a shew as if you did iudge the same lawfull. It is therefore euident truth (& the contrary impious) that Generall Councils appoynted of Christ, *as the highest externall Tribunals the Church hath on earth, and which bind all persons to externall obedience*, are infallible. And if they be infallible, then they who moued with conceyte of their priuate skill in Scripture, which they pretend to haue gotten by the excellency of their wit & discourse; or by singular illumination from God, reiect their iudgment, and openly *Protest* that they may erre and haue erred, are proued damnable Heretiques.

The eight Conuiction.

33. **P**ROtesters are Heretiques, because they condemn and contemne that Church, vpon whose authority they haue believed Christ, and Christian Religion. For they haue receaued Christ and the grounds of Christianity by the preaching, and vpon the Authority of some Church, as you say *cap. 3. n. 33. 2. n. 101.* *(a) Cap. lin. 10.* Now the Authority of this Church ought to be to them to firme, and infallible as their Christianity, so as they should rather not belieue in Christ, then belieue any thing against them by whome they believed Christ. This you teach *pag. 90 lin. 2.* *Why should I not most diligently inquire, what Christ commanded, of them (the Church of England) before all others, by whose Authority I was moued to beliene, that Christ commanded any good thing? Can you F. or K. or whosoever you are, better declare to me what he sayd, whom I would not haue thought to haue beene, or to bee, if the beliefe thereof had beene recommended to me by you &c? Surely, if they were not at all, and could not teach me any thing; I would more easely perswade my selfe, that I were not to belieue in Christ, then that I should learne any thing concerning him from any other, then them by whome I believed him.* This is your discourse, full of impieties: because what *S. Augustine* sayth of the whole Christian Catholique Church, you apply to the Protestant Church of England. It is false, that any true Christian belieues in Christ by resting on the Authority of the Church of England; nor doth this Church, if it make Christians, propose her selfe, but the Holy Catholique Church, for the irrefragable witnesse of Christ. It is impious, that you would neuer haue believed Christ nor Christianity, if the beliefe thereof had beene recommended to

you by us, that is, by preachers of the Roman Church, and Holy monkes sent you for that office from Rome. It is Antichristian to professe, *that you would more easely not believe in Christ, then learne any thing concerning him from any other, then them (the Church of England) by whom you believed him*: so that if the Church of England should fall away from Christ into Infidelity, you professe aforehand, that you will fall away, and become an Infidell with her.

34. Hence it is cleere, that the saying of S. Augustine, *I would not believe the Gospell unless the Authority of the Church did move me: I would more easely persuade my selfe, that I were not to believe Christ, then that I should learne any thing concerning him from any other then them by whom I believed him*; this Profession I say though most euident truth, cannot without impiety be applyed to any Church which is not indefectible, and infallible in all her Proposals. It is euident truth, because *the prooffe must be to vs more manifest, and we surer of the truth thereof then the thing proued thereby, otherwise it is no prooffe as you say Cap. 6 n. 9. in fine.* But the only prooffe, the only motiue and reason we haue to believe Christ, that he liued on earth, and that his doctrine and Religion is contayned in the Christian Scripture, is the Catholique Church and her word and Tradition, as you often grant. Therefore as *S. Augustine sayth, how can we haue euidence of Christ, if we haue not euidence of the Church*, that she cannot erre in her Proposals? And if true Christians be surer of the Tradition of the Church then of Christ, then according to reason they may sooner disbelieve Christ then the vniuersall Church. But you Protest against the visible Catholique Church, that *she is not free from damnable errors in sayth and damnable corruptions in practise,* that

Cap. 5. n.
64. lin. 8.

that Church by whom you haue believed Christ if you do truely and Christianly believe in him: How then can you be Christians, or haue any grounded assurance of fayth concerning him? You will say, that you haue believed in Christ not by this present Catholique Church, but by the Church of all ages. This is vaine, because you can haue no assurance of the Church of all former ages, and of what they believed and taught, but by the word and testimony of the present. Nor do you hold the Church of all ages infallible, yea you expressly teach that the same was presently vpon the Apostles death *couered with darkenesse and vniuersall Errours*: how then be you not heretiques and false Christians, who believe Christ and Christianity vpon no other, or better ground then your owne fancy?

Cap. 5. n.
91. post
medium.

The ninth Conuiction.

35. **P**rotesters destroy by their doctrine the being & essence of the Catho. Christian Church: But the doctrine destructive of the Church, or the deniall of the holy Catholique Church is a damnable blasphemous heresy. *Ergo, protesters be Heretiques* of the worser and more damnable sort; You deny both Propositions of this Argument, yet you teach principles by which they are demonstratiuely cleared against you. The *maior* is proued, because you often teach (and it is the mayne point of your Religion, that the whole Catholique (a) Church is subiect to errours, to damnable errours, yea (b) *to fundamentall errours in some kind*: But this doctrine doth totally and essentially ouerthrow the being of the Church. For you grant that the Church is alwayes by essence the Rocke and ground, (c) that is, alwayes the actual Teacher of all necessary truth: so

(a) Pag.
291. lin.
9. or c. 5.
n. 88 in
medio.

(b) Cap.
5. n. 7.
Cap. 3. n.
36. li. 12.

Cap. 5.
per totū.

that they who take this from her, take her essence from her, and essentially destroy her being. But he who sayth that the Church is subject to errors in matter of fayth maketh the Church not to be the pillar and ground of truth; for you say, *An authority subject to error cannot be a firme and stable foundation, (a pillar and ground) of beliefe in anything.* Ergo, they that make the Church fallible and subject to some errors, in some proposalls of fayth, destroy her essence. Hence your distinction of a true Church, and of a pure Church free from errors, and that there was, ever shall be a true Christian Catholique Church in the world, but not a pure, vnspotted Church from all errors; this distinction, I say, by you repeated many hundred of times is vayne: for I haue demonstrated, that impurity in matter of fayth, yea possibility to be impure and erroneous in any Proposals of Fayth, is against the very essence of the Church, The minor also you deny. Cap. 2. n. 13. lin. 12. *If Zelots had* *beld, that there was not only no pure visible Church, but none* *at all, surely they had said more then they could iustify: but yet* *you do not see, nor can I discover any such vast absurdity or* *sacrilegious Blasphemy in this assertion.* Thus you. And this fancy then did so occupy the short capacity of your brayne, that the contrary declaratiōs which you make in your Booke were driuen quite out of your mind. Pag. 336. lin. 25. *Into such an heresie (which destroyeth essentially Christianity) if the Church should fall, it might be said more truly to perish then if it fell only into some errors of its owne nature damnable; for in that state all the members of it without exception, all without mercy must perish for ever.* Thus you, teaching that if the Church perish essentially and remayne Christian, not in Truth, but only in name, that all the members thereof without exception, all without mercy perish with it. Can any absurdity be more vast, and

Sec. Edit.
6 n. 9.
circamed.

and full of horroure then this? You teach this immanity to be consequent vpon the totall destruction of the Church; and yet say, that you cannot discouer any *such vast absurdity* in that *destructiue doctrine*. So small a matter it seemes to you to grant, that all Christians since the dayes of the *Apostles* perished euerlastingly.

36. Is it not *sacrilegious blasphemy* to make Christ a false Prophet, who sayd, *that the gates of Hell should neuer preuaile against it*? Which promise doth import, as you acknowledge *cap. 3. m. 70*, that *she shall alwayes continue a true Church, and bring forth children vnto God, and send soules to Heauen*. Now, they who contend, that there was for many ages no Church, make this promise of our Lord to be false. Therefore they are guilty of most *sacrilegious Blasphemy*, as the *Maintayner of Charity* said, and none will deny that hath in him any sparke of *Charity* towards Christ.

The Conclusion.

37. **A** Nd now giue me leaue (Courteous Reader) to make an end. For what hath been said may more then abundantly suffice, to shew the vanity of this mans enterprize, who would cut out a *safe way to Saluation* through the flint of *Heretical obstinacy*. If any thinke this cannot be performed against such a volume by a Treatise so small as this is, for bignesse not comparable vnto his; let him examine comparatiuely the strength, the pith the arguments of the one with the other, and I do not doubt but in this comparison the *Pro-uerbe* will also be found true,

A Cane non magno saepe tenetur aper.

38. The *Crocodile*, that vast venemous Serpent of *Nilus* is conquered and made away by a litle fish tear-
med

med *Ichneumon*, which watching an opportunity, and finding the *Crocodile* sleeping with his mouth wide open, by that ouerture getteth in, and there vasteth and destroyeth all his vital parts. This our Aduersary hath *opened his mouth*, no man wider, into bold reproach and reprehensio of the whole Christian Catholique Church; but he doth it alwayes *Sleepingly*, with such dull inconsideration, with such manifest contradiction of himselfe, as he *lyeth open* to any Aduersary to enter vpon him, and worke his confusion, by shewing the *intestine* dissension of his most *intime*, and essentiall doctrines one against another: I am content to venture it to the verdict of any learned and iudicious *Protestant*, who hath attentiuely perused his large Volume, and this short Reply, whether I haue not overthrowne the grounds and foundations of his edifice, destroytd all the most intrinsecall Principles that haue influence of life into his discourse.

39. His Booke indeed is a vast bulke made big, not with variety of matters and proofes, but by the repetition of those principles I haue proued in this Treatise to be both false, & contradicted, impugned, reiecte euen by himselfe: Principles I say, by him insisted on, vrged and repeated some many hundreds, some euen thousands of times. For the rest it is an heape of manifest slanders, base calumniation, ridiculous brags, vild, reproaches, concumelious speachs against the Church, the Pope, the Iesuits, and namely the Authour of *Charity mainsayned*, wide mistaking of the force of his Aduersaries Arguments, wild and exorbitant answeres, his arguing vpon this false supposition pittifully *begged*, & assumed *gratis* without (I will not say a *Schillingworth*, but) a *Pennyworth* of prooffe, that our Religion is but the
Do.

Doctrin of the Councell of Trent, his, the pure Word of God, the Bible, and onely the Bible. These Arguments for multitude innumerable, and diffused by large extent ouer all the leaues, pages, and numbers of his booke, make it vnworthy to be read, and much more vnworthy to be, for all the particulars thereof, distinctly answered, and refuted.

40. I also would haue him to know, that I keepe more then an hundred of his contradictions and grosse ignorances in store to bestow on him for his reward, if he shal vndertake to reply. These I omitted in this Treatise, not to cloy with superfluities, the appetite of iudicious Readers, who with the discouery of a few grosse contradictions (such as these be wherwith I haue charged him) remaine satisfied, and filled with contempt of such a writer. I likewise was fearefull least by some, the censure of small discretion might belayd vpon me, for spending so much time agaynst such an vnworthy writing, wherein the Authour himselfe will not be able to shew three Pages together which be coherent, and not contradictory against other parts of his Booke. Finally many new contradictions and impertinences by him vttered will be layd open in the Treatise of the *Totall Summe*, which I intend as an *Appendix* vnto this.

FINIS.

Faults escaped in the Print.

P	Age.	Line.	Errour.	Correction.
25.	20.		you consider	you : consider
25.	10.		part	heart
26.	7.		are	are
28.	10.		of, this	of this
38.	32.		prach't	preach't
45.	18.		world One	world: One
60.	12.		as our	as you
Ibid.	27.		thus you I	thus you : I
Ibid.	27.		I not say	I cannot say
95.	15.		certainne	contayned
98.	15.		sole	soule
100.	26.		booke) but	booke; but
Ibid.	27.		it selfe:	it selfe)
102.	16.		tradition, for	Tradition. For
103.	5.		the rule	the only rule
106.	5.		should be so	should do so
126.	8.		by whome	of whome
131.	27.		not firme	no firme
158.	20.		ente	enter
181.	20.		Propenent	Proponent.

C 11110 SL
20084

REPRODUCED FROM THE COPY IN THE

HENRY E. HUNTINGTON LIBRARY

FOR REFERENCE ONLY. NOT FOR REPRODUCTION.